The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1935 NUMBER 1094

Contents

The Week 29

Editorials

Conservative Britain 32
Business Wins an Election 33

General Articles

Funny Business in Baltimore ..... T. R. B. 35
They Cry "Peace, Peace": III ..... Bruce Bliven 38
Underground (verse) ..... Don Gordon 40
Mussolini: Megalomaniac ..... Foreign Observer 41
The Machines ..... A. I. Bezzerides 43
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 44
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 45
On the Labor Front ..... William P. Mangold 46

Correspondence 47

Dead End: II ..... Stark Young 49

Books in Review

Mark Twain the American ..... Robert Morss Lovett 50
The Newest History ..... Eugene Newton Anderson 51
African Travelogue ..... Melville J. Herskovits 52
Spain and the Jews ..... Isidor Schneider 52
Munsey to the Life ..... Lincoln Steffens 53
After Strange Gods ..... Max Lerner 53
Books in Brief 54

The Week

CHINA took the international spotlight this week as Europe showed no major changes in surface relations and the Italian armies continued an accelerated but still largely unopposed advance into Ethiopia. A tense situation developed at Shanghai when a Japanese Marine was shot and killed by an unidentified assailant. Troops were landed from Japanese warships and Chinese residents fled in terror from the Chapei district, fearing another "pacification," as in 1932. Earlier in the week the Nanking government, under pressure of severe deflation caused by the silver-purchasing policy of the United States, issued a decree calling for the surrender of all silver stocks to be impounded by the government and the withdrawal of monetized metal in favor of a managed paper currency. Japanese commercial and governmental interests, apparently not consulted in advance, showed anger and chagrin over this sudden decree, especially when it was coupled with rumors of a large British loan to China. The result was a general police of several cities took extra precautions to of military force than seemed called for by the Shanghai incident, and renewed agitation to have North China declare its autonomy under Japanese sponsorship. Some observers think such a move in North China is imminent, and there are disquieting possibilities of friction between Japan and the Soviet Union if the plan is carried out.

ETHIOPIA still refuses to give battle to the advancing Italian columns that this week occupied Makale in the north and Sasa Baneh in the south. As the advance continues, however, the lines of communication grow longer and thinner and the peril to the invader increases proportionately. In Rome, Mussolini had a long personal talk with Sir Eric Drummond, the British Ambassador, but apparently little was accomplished to relieve the deadlock occasioned by Britain's unwillingness to reduce her naval forces in the Mediterranean and Mussolini's unwillingness to withdraw more troops from Libya until the other side has moved first. In Great Britain itself nothing occurred to change the general expectation of a Conservative victory in the general election scheduled for Thursday, although the Laborites were beginning to develop a more effective opposition than they were able to muster earlier in the campaign.

GERMANY'S chief event of the week was Hitler's decree disbanding the veterans' organization, the Stalhelm, once the main support of the monarchists and more recently a kind of conservative brake on some of the extremist policies of the Nazis. Abolition of the Stalhelm was widely interpreted as leaving the Nazis in supreme control, but its actual effect was to concentrate practically the entire armed power of the state in the hands of the Reichswehr. Thus far, the Reichswehr has shown no disposition to interfere with or remove Hitler, but if the army ever decided to unseat him, his now greatly attenuated Storm Troopers would be powerless to keep him in office. Meanwhile, protests against food regulations, riots and incipient strikes gave evidence of Germany's severe economic strain. France showed considerable internal tension as the Stavisky trials began in Paris and the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of King George II formally announcing his return to the throne of Greece, after a delegation from the homeland had waited upon him with results of the recent pro-royalist plebiscite. Following this ceremony, the Grecian ruler was a luncheon guest of King George and Queen Mary at Buckingham Palace, foreshadowing a pro-British orientation of Greece in present and future alignments in the Mediterranean.

AMERICA'S chief interest of the week lay in the making of reciprocal trade agreements with Canada. The new Canadian Premier, W. L. Mackenzie King, after an overnight visit in the White House as guest of President Roosevelt, interrupted his holiday trip to the south to rush back to Ottawa for a special meeting of his Cabinet ministers. On Armistice Day announcements were made simultaneously in Ottawa and Washington that a definite agreement had been reached and that detailed tariff schedules, allowing for an interchange of commodities, were being worked out by trade experts of the two countries. The making of these agreements fulfills the campaign promises of Premier King and marks a step forward in the long cherished principles of Secretary Hull, who was a participant in the negotiations. The general plan is to permit the entry of Canadian fish, agricultural products and, probably, whiskey, into the United States, in return for a greater market for American machinery and manufactured products in Canada.

ARMISTICE DAY was observed in generally peaceful fashion throughout the world. Germany, as usual, gave no sign of recognition that such an anniversary existed, and in Paris, largely on account of an extraordinary concentration of police, the expected riots between right and left-wing sympathizers did not materialize. Solemn observances were held in London, Washington, Ottawa and other capitals, and President Roosevelt made a speech in which he again emphasized this country's desire for peace and pointed out the dangers of seeking commercial profit from conflicts anywhere in the world. In Rome, Armistice Day coincided with the sixty-sixth birthday of King Victor Emmanuel, but it was Mussolini who stood in the reviewing stand and received the salutes at the impressive military display. Mussolini also took occasion on Armistice Day to send simultaneous notes to all countries in the League of Nations that have agreed to impose sanctions on Italy, pointing out the seriousness of this step, asking each country if it was individually willing to take any consequences that might ensue, and carrying the veiled threat of Italian withdrawal from the League.

THE State Department's views on neutrality were set forth at length last week in a radio speech by Secretary Hull. Mr. Hull came out strongly against [illegible] law-making is mandatory for hostility to investors. Non-registration would both belligerents at the outbreak of war. Such a program he stigmatized as "a weak one, indeed." He pleaded for a "virile" policy, by which he apparently means one that would give the State Department the right to decide when and how an embargo should be imposed. Mr. Hull is correct in saying that if discretion is left with the executive branch of the government to decide our policy in the event of another war, our influence in international affairs will be much greater than if we are committed beforehand to a program of rigid neutrality. He does not, however, answer the argument of peace advocates that it was the failure of this country to have a mandatory neutrality program in 1914 that led us into the World War, and that the failure to adopt such a program now will greatly increase the danger of being drawn into another one.

ARMY balloonists scored a notable achievement in the flight of the stratosphere balloon, "Explorer II," jointly sponsored by the Army Air Corps and the National Geographic Society, which, at an unofficial figure of 74,000 feet, reached the highest altitude yet attained by man and collected valuable scientific data. The jury in a federal court in St. Louis brought in a verdict of not guilty in what was regarded as a major attempt by the government and independent exhibitors to obtain a conviction for monopolistic trade practices against the leading motion-picture companies. Out of the results of last week's elections, political observers noted three main trends. The existence of a drift away from Roosevelt in the North and East was confirmed, but the extent and eventual effects of this drift remained distinctly matters for argument. Kentucky, and by inference the border states and the South generally, probably will remain in line for Roosevelt in the 1936 elections. Tammany has regained a large measure of its accustomed power in New York City and the size of the metropolitan majority it does or does not roll up next year may determine which way New York State will go in the national elections.

THE curious proceedings leading up to the decision of Judge Coleman that declared the utility holding-company law unconstitutional are described in the article in this issue of The New Republic entitled "Funny Business in Baltimore." As a result of their great victory, many of the companies are seriously considering not registering with the Securities Commission by December 1, as the law requires. Commissioner Landis has warned them that if they do not follow this simple procedure, and the decision should be reversed by a higher court, their stockholders might suffer heavy losses on account of the penalties imposed for non-registration. We suppose, however, that if stockholders lose anything on this account, the holding-company managements will follow their usual custom of blaming the government

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the Supreme Court will share Judge Coleman's views—or indeed a belief that the case will not be appealed. But if Burco, Inc., does not appeal, support will be lent to the government's charge that it was not a sincere contestant, and that the whole legal proceeding was a put-up job to prevent the government from being a party in a straight and open contest.

THE fact that negotiations have been tentatively arranged between France and Germany was admitted last week by the semi-official organ, Le Temps. An understanding with the Nazi leaders has long been the ambition of Laval and his backers among French heavy industry. It is no secret that its purpose would be to give Hitler a free hand against Soviet Russia. Fortunately, not only the French People's Front, but also the Center under Herriot are stoutly opposed to any such step. They argue that if Hitler were to win a war against Soviet Russia, his next move would be to turn to the west and threaten France. The prospects of continued peace in Europe are doubtful enough in any case, but for France to egg Hitler on to attack Russia would probably make certain a conflict eventually involving most of the world.

ON THE subject of indecency, particularly in the case of the play "Tobacco Road," Miss Sally Rand of all people has slipped into some clothes long enough to say a few words to the boys in the city room. Morality from Miss Rand is of course very quaint news, and so she makes a column of free publicity out of it, with critical quotations. "The language and actions of 'Tobacco Road,'" she says, yessing Mayor Kelly who closed the play in Chicago (where curiously enough they closed Miss Rand herself in 1933), "were indecent and obscene, and its plot is inartistic. The play sickened me when I first saw it . . . and has continued to sicken me every time I have seen it since." Having spoken which, Miss Rand presumably took something to settle her stomach and returned to her own little act, glad to be back out of harness again. The Sally Rand act stems simply enough from the principle of strip-tease, which assumes that if a woman can be clever enough about not quite taking her clothes off, and make it last, there will be found enough people with Tom-the-Peeper complexes to make a profit at the box office. And it all reminds us that there are several kinds of indecency and that people who dance in glass houses should be more careful to undress their mental habits in the dark.

WHEN white-collar workers strike, they meet the realities of the class struggle in short order—just as speedily, in fact, as though they were sharecroppers in the South or longshoremen in San Francisco. Take, for example, the strike of some ninety girl clerks at May's Department Store in Brooklyn, New York. The owners of the stor[illegible]

pathizers arrested during the three weeks the strike has lasted on charges ranging from "disorderly conduct" to "conspiracy to interfere with business." And all this merely because the employees are engaging in perfectly legal strike activity—peaceful picketing—against low wages and intolerable working conditions. Wholesale arrests of pickets may not be quite so ruthless as tear-gas and bayonet attacks, but they are just as helpful to employers in breaking up a strike. Bail for many of the May strikers has been set as high as $300 to $500 and for the two arrested on the "conspiracy" charge it was $1,000. It is improbable that these charges will be upheld in court—the New York penal law specifically declares that a strike is not a conspiracy—but that offers slight consolation to the striking employees who are, meanwhile, denied the right to picket. One of the features of the May strike has been the sympathetic picketing conducted by the League of Women Shoppers, an organization formed to improve working conditions in factories and stores handling consumer goods. Many of the League's members are prominent figures in society or actively engaged in business, law, writing, art and other fields. Mayor LaGuardia has asked the League to serve as an unofficial investigating body for him, but the police regard the League's pickets in about the same light as ordinary pickets. Last week they arrested several, including a niece of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mrs. Josephine Wertheim Pomerance.

THE company unions in steel, rubber and other industries are acting up in a very strange manner these days. In the plants of the American Sheet and Tin Plate Company, a division of the United States Steel Corporation, they recently decided to hold a national convention—something virtually unheard of in company-union practice. But that was only the beginning. The convention, attended by thirty-three delegates representing 23,000 workers in every one of the company's twelve plants, refused to allow management representatives to be present—an action that comes perilously close to being insurrection. The delegates then proceeded to formulate demands for a 15 to 25-percent wage increase and a revision of the pension system; an executive committee of three "national" officers was elected to fight for these demands. News of this spread rapidly to other steel centers. The company union of the Jones and Laughlin plant at Aliquippa, Pennsylvania, representing 10,000 workers, called a meeting and voted to demand a 15-percent wage increase. Similar demands followed at the Duquesne plant of Carnegie Steel, at the Warren, Ohio, plant of Republic Steel and at the Weirton, West Virginia, Steel Company. In the rubber industry the Goodrich and Goodyear company unions are fighting for maintenance of the six-hour day. At Akron, Ohio, the Goodrich union refused recently

LICENSED TO UDT.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"stronger action" if hours were lengthened. It will be interesting to see what results are obtained by these strange doings and even stranger language of the company unions.

Conservative Britain

WHILE this issue of The New Republic is being distributed to its readers, the voters of Great Britain will be casting their ballots to elect a new government. The result is, in general terms, almost a foregone conclusion. Most informed persons take it for granted that the National Government—which is in reality almost completely Conservative, with a few adhesions from former Labor and Liberal leaders—will be returned to power, but with a greatly decreased majority. The Labor Party will be the principal gainer. The chief uncertainty relates to the number of seats it will win. The Liberals will count little; their party has all but disappeared.

Americans may conclude that this result has much the same significance as would an election in the United States in which the Republicans should re-elect a President, losing a number of seats in Congress to the "socialistic" Democrats. The inference is likely to be drawn that Great Britain, unlike the United States, has been governed during recent years on traditionally conservative lines, that the present recovery is a deserved reward for the application of "sound finance" in government and of private enterprise in business, that a majority of the electorate are showing their gratitude for recovery and their confidence in the rulers who brought it about. The gains for labor are likely to be interpreted merely as a natural swing of the pendulum away from a government that has been in power for several years. But these theories are completely at variance with the actual situation in Great Britain.

In the first place, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that many of the main parts of Mr. Roosevelt's program, for which he is denounced as a radical who gets his ideas from Communists or college professors, are actually in effect in Great Britain, and have been matters of course for many years. Indeed, Mr. Roosevelt in many respects has not even proposed to go so far as England has already gone; certainly his achievements have taken only a tiny step along the road that the British have been traveling for more than a generation.

Let us list some of the principal ways in which Britain is abreast of or ahead of the position to which the present administration has rather feebly tried to lead the United States:

> Almost all the workers are organized in unions; wages and hours and conditions of work are generally set by genuine collective bargaining; "company unions" [illegible] employer who opposes the existence

Minimum wages are enforced in sweated industries by the power of national law.

National unemployment insurance has been in operation since before the War; national appropriations for the sustenance of the unemployed are made as a matter of course. The whole system, while it is often a center of controversy, is administered competently as a permanent institution. The Conservatives have not the slightest intention of abolishing it.

No court has the power to declare an act of Parliament unconstitutional. The legislative representatives of the people are supreme. They can and sometimes do pass legislation that our Supreme Court would throw out of the window. Large property owners submit to the expressed will of the voters' representatives. No party would dream of proposing anything like our judicial veto.

The national government has unlimited authority over subordinate units; any doctrine parallel to our "states' rights" is unknown. When decentralization is practised, it is chosen as a matter of policy or administrative convenience, not as a matter of right.

All through the depression, the government has spent huge sums to subsidize good housing for the workers. This has stimulated private housing as well. You cannot go anywhere in England, even in the "depressed areas," without seeing great housing developments and a considerable amount of new construction.

Other types of social legislation, much of it establishing agencies subsidized by the state, are well advanced.

A large amount of government spending to relieve unemployment, to build housing, etc., is the rule—not merely as a temporary emergency measure, but continuously. In spite of this spending, the national budget is in balance. It is balanced, however, not by eliminating government activities, but by extremely heavy taxes on incomes and inheritances, which nobody seriously proposes to reduce.

Government ownership and government regulation of private business are much more extensive than in this country. Much of electric power, for instance, is publicly owned, while the whole system is integrated under a single authority. Publicly owned transport is common.

Although the National Government came into power with the plea that it was going to save the pound, the gold standard was abandoned immediately afterwards, and Great Britain, like the United States, has in effect devaluated her currency.

The Republican Party in this country looks with horror upon developments of this kind. The Conservative Party, while it is not responsible for the inauguration of most of these measures, does not propose to abolish them. Indeed, its election manifesto promises more liberal treatment of the unemployed, more government housing, and a national improvement of education. The most reactionary party in Great Britain is, in this sense, to the left of Mr. Roosevelt.

In spite of—or, it might truly be said, because of—these advanced governmental institutions, Britain suffered less severely in the depression than did we, [illegible] of it more visibly and more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voters is dissatisfied, not only with the progress made, but with the whole economic system that permits depressions and unemployment to occur. The Labor Party is not like Mr. Roosevelt's Democratic; it is solidly based on the organized workers, and it is genuinely socialistic. Its official program proposes a great extension of national ownership and management of industry and banking for the benefit of the workers; a powerful left wing wants to go even faster and further. Its gains in this election represent, not a swing-back from Tweedledum to Tweedledee, but something like the normal growth of a real opposition, which it has been enjoying for many years.

In the last election the Conservatives managed to win by a landslide that they started by creating a political panic about the financial situation. It was an abnormal and artificial victory. Two previous overturns had likewise been panic elections, with issues trumped up to stampede voters away from the growing cohorts of labor, with its socialistic program. There was the notorious "Zinoviev letter," there was the khaki election after the War. Only by factitious excitement of this kind can the socialist trend be checked, and then only temporarily.

It is charged by labor that the present election was precipitated by the Conservatives with undue haste to capitalize the international crisis. The voters are asked to rally behind the government in its League policy. Greater armament, and particularly a more modern navy, is the chief plank of the party in power; if the electorate is frightened enough concerning a threatened war, those who advocate a "strong" policy and plenty of ships may gain an advantage. But every such election weakens democracy and gradualism. If capitalism can keep its power in England only by a succession of such maneuvers, it is doomed anyway. The indications are that in this case the Conservatives underestimated the opposition. The voters, so far, have shown no signs of being stampeded.

One lesson for us in America is that the outcries of our conservatives are contemptible buncombe. Capitalism can survive—indeed it can revive—under a far more civilized and democratic system than we enjoy. Large amounts are now being invested in new productive enterprises in Great Britain, in spite of the existence of a mass of social legislation, heavy taxes and considerable governmental "interference" with business—yes, even in the face of prospective gains by a socialist labor party. Another lesson for us is that the only reliable path of political progress is not to rely upon the luck of having an occasional leader who happens to be liberally inclined, but to build, steadily and surely, a party that is based upon the workers and looks forward to a socialist order. Nobody expects British Labor to abolish capitalism the moment it gains power; but no informed person would deny that Great Britain is much closer to socialism than is the United States.

Business Wins an Election

MR. ROOSEVELT has made several attempts to conciliate business. The latest was his breathing-spell letter to Roy W. Howard, written after the close of Congress, in which he endeavored to assure business of his warm regard for its welfare. Last week's elections, however, do not show that his kind wishes are reciprocated. All of the Democratic Party's losses appear to have been directly caused by business hostility.

In many of the contests, particularly in New York, New Jersey and Philadelphia, the New Deal was explicitly the chief issue. In each case, business support was unitedly behind the Republican candidates and was the reason for their victories. In Kentucky, the one state where the Democratic vote exceeded Mr. Farley's expectations, the New Deal had little or no part in the campaign.

The degree to which business opposition is solidifying against Mr. Roosevelt is being freshly illustrated by the poll the United States Chamber of Commerce is taking of its member branches. Preliminary returns disclose a fourteen-to-one vote against the New Deal program. It begins to look doubtful whether Mr. Roosevelt's frequent concessions to business were, after all, smart strategy.

It is generally agreed that Mr. Roosevelt is as strong as ever in the agricultural South and Middle West, but that he is slowly losing popularity in the industrial Northeast. In carrying out his agricultural program, Mr. Roosevelt has never yielded on an important principle, so far as protection of the farmers was concerned. Since its establishment, the A.A.A. has been fought by the meat packers, flour millers, speculators on the Chicago Board of Trade and other business groups. The A.A.A. has often failed to support aggressively the interests of the consumer and agricultural workers, but it has never retreated when the principles on which it was constituted were in jeopardy.

The result has been that a program has been actually put in operation. The propertied farmers, at least, have greatly benefited. This fact is interestingly reflected in the United States Chamber of Commerce's poll. In the early returns, all local business groups in the Northeast, without exception, are against the New Deal. But in Des Moines, capital of the corn-hog area, the local chamber of commerce returned its ballot to Washington unanswered, as did that of Grand Forks, North Dakota. The St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, after a vote of its members, decided not to make public the result. Helena and Kalispell, Montana, were in favor of the New Deal. The Columbia, South Carolina, Chamber of Commerce announced its intention of resigning from the national organization as a protest against the poll.

There is no reason to suppose that the business men of the South and Middle West are any

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Presumably the majority of them have the same veneration for the Constitution, as interpreted by corporation lawyers, and the same nervous distrust of intelligence in Washington. The difference is that the business men of the South and Middle West have seen conditions in their localities improve at an extraordinary rate. They are also beginning to have confidence that, because of the A.A.A., the improvement will be permanent.

A further episode is worth retelling. Last week at Chattanooga, Tennessee, a meeting was held of the United States Chamber of Commerce's Southeastern division. A resolution was proposed condemning government competition with privately owned utilities, which was understood to refer to the T.V.A. When the resolution was carried, the Knoxville business group arose and marched from the room, but not before one of them had bitterly exclaimed: "The United States Chamber of Commerce has opposed everything for the good of the South and the Tennessee Valley."

The T.V.A. is an experiment in social planning. It is antithetical to laissez-faire business philosophy. Yet its development of hydro-electric power has already brought about increased business activity in the Tennessee Valley, and promises to make it a large industrial center. Land values, particularly in Knoxville, have risen, and Knoxville business men seem content.

In Mr. Roosevelt's industrial program, the intended equivalent of the farmer was the industrial worker. In theory, the benefits accruing to business under the N.R.A. were to have been largely indirect. The purpose of the A.A.A. was to increase the circulation of goods by raising farm income; the purpose of the N.R.A. was to do the same by raising the income of factory employees. It was to have achieved this purpose through a direct increase of wages, shorter hours and the right to bargain collectively. But where the A.A.A. stood firm on its principles, almost from the first the N.R.A. yielded to business pressure. Mr. Roosevelt approved codes that raised wages and shortened hours only slightly, if at all. In the case of the steel industry and a number of others, he approved codes after the employers had let it be known that they would never permit independent unionization. After the establishment of the National Labor Relations Board, he abjectly surrendered to the publishers in the Jennings case. He surrendered with equal abjectness to the automobile manufacturers in extending the life of the Automobile Labor Board. Little or no check was placed on price policies in the interest of the consumer.

Looked at from a political point of view, relief payments and unemployment insurance are the industrial parallels of the A.A.A. processing taxes. The latter are levies upon the consumer to bring farm income up to a predetermined level; relief payments and unemployment insurance are designed to do the same for the total income of wage earners. adequate system of relief. Then, to conciliate business, he dropped the C.W.A. A year later, again to conciliate business, he greatly curtailed Harry Hopkins' work-relief program. Still trying to conciliate business, he refused to permit the prevailing wage clause to be incorporated in the present $4,000,000,000 relief program, as organized labor had demanded. When the Social Security Act was approved by Congress last winter, he permitted the rates to be cut far below those recommended by his expert advisers. The result of these attempts to kowtow to business has been that mass purchasing power in the industrial Northeast is neither so large nor so permanent as it is in the farm areas.

Doubtless if Mr. Roosevelt had stood rigidly for the fundamental principles of his industrial program, business men would have been angry. But it is reasonable to suppose that had a policy of increased wages, shortened hours and intensive unionization been vigorously pursued from the beginning of Mr. Roosevelt's term, prosperity would be diffused to a greater extent in industrial regions than it is at present, and unemployment would be less. And it also seems reasonable to assume that this might have mitigated the wrath of business men. In any case, however, it would have brought him the same devoted support among industrial workers that he now has among most farmers.

Recently Mr. Roosevelt announced that the A.A.A. was to be made permanent. If, in the Hoosac Mills case, the Supreme Court declares the A.A.A. unconstitutional, apparently Mr. Roosevelt does not intend to let the opposition of food processors and the textile interests deter him from attempting to prepare a substitute. But he has given no indication that he will try to restore the benefits of the N.R.A. to industrial labor. The A.F. of L. has asked him to agree to support a constitutional amendment to validate the principles of the N.R.A., and he has so far declined to give a public commitment. Mr. Roosevelt ought to take last week's elections as a sign that he has little to lose in ceasing to propitiate business, and everything to gain if he can and will carry out his original promises to labor.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1935, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HAMILTON BASSO H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY
JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN
W. P. MANGOLD R. G. TUGWELL LEWIS MUMFORD
JONATHAN MITCHELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Funny Business in Baltimore

The Public Utilities Cold-Shoulder Uncle Sam

BAD LUCK has clung more closely to the heels of public-utility holding companies than to any other big industry in years. There was first, some time back, the accident of investigation. Somebody wanted a congressional committee to investigate the electric-power and light companies. Ordinarily, a congressional committee can become quite dangerous, while an investigation by an administrative commission is not so bad. Reasoning with reliable logic, men who feared the proposed investigation had it shunted to the Federal Trade Commission, to let it die there.

Who could have foreseen what Judge Healy, conservative Vermont lawyer, counsel to the Federal Trade Commission, would do? His appointment had looked like a thoroughly safe one. But he became seriously interested in the Senate's orders to the Commission. He made the investigation of the public-utility companies one of the most thorough jobs in American governmental history. He disclosed the write-ups of millions of dollars, the pyramiding of corporations, the milking of operating companies by management affiliates, service affiliates, finance affiliates and all the fancy corporate devices of the nineteen twenties. Hearing after hearing, month after month, year after year, the evidence piled in—ten volumes of printed testimony, twenty volumes, fifty volumes, a library of the most revealing and devastating evidence. The material was now at hand for anyone who had the power to act.

However, evidence has been buried in libraries before. There was so much about the utilities, in all the scores of government volumes, that no one would read the stuff unless he was looking for help in a campaign to which he was already dedicated. Fate once more went out of its way. It put into the White House a Roosevelt who had strong views about iniquities in the public-utility field and about the danger of holding companies. He called for a law, not to attempt regulation that could not work, but to abolish what he regarded as excrescences in the financial scene.

This in itself might not have been fatal. Laws to control big business have been demanded by other Presidents. Congress has passed them, and jokers were later found in the statutes, or the draftsmen were slipshod, so that the laws have worked badly or not at all. This time things were different. Roosevelt had an emergency squad, two energetic lawyers named Cohen and Corcoran. He had used them, together with Landis (the present chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission), in drafting the securities business. He used them in 1934 to prepare the bill for regulation of stock exchanges. Both laws were models of draftsmanship, and brilliant creations in the field of legislation. Even Wall Street lawyers who opposed the bills confessed in private their admiration of the craftsmanship behind them. It was the misfortune of the holding companies that the President entrusted the attack upon this industry to the now seasoned team of Cohen and Corcoran. It was a further blow that the spokesmen for the bill were Wheeler in the Senate and Rayburn in the House—experienced, staunch and skillful.

Misfortunes continued to fall relentlessly, as in a Greek tragedy. Brewster, the Congressman from Maine, attacked Corcoran on the floor of the House, and from this flowed two evil consequences for the holding companies. The newspapermen and official Washington heard Corcoran's detailed statement, which made of Brewster's attack a boomerang injurious to the public utilities. Worse still, the incident led to a demand in the Senate for investigation of the lobbying of the holding companies. This inquiry was assigned to Senator Black, who had conducted investigations before and been successful at it. With lightning speed, he showed how public-utility agents had faked signatures to telegrams urging Congressmen to oppose the President's bill, had burned incriminating evidence, had engineered countrywide propaganda against the bill, and had spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of investors' money to continue the holding-company executives in control of the public's investments. No industry, not even the hitherto all-powerful electric light and power industry, could overcome this series of unfortunate accidents. The Roosevelt program, with compromise amendments of none too serious a nature, became the law of the land.

I

But not for long—so reasoned the holding-company leaders. Groups of able lawyers in Wall Street firms went promptly to work. Day, night and Sunday, they manufactured the ammunition to shoot the holding-company law full of holes. The Constitution would save the public-utility pyramids. All that was needed was a lawsuit to bring the law before a federal judge who could exercise his power to declare the statute null and void.

In this, the most recent act in the drama, accidents have rained down on the holding companies

ARCHIVED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thought they had done their best. They hired John W. Davis, perhaps the ablest advocate big corporations can get in America today. Just as they picked the best man for the leading role, so he picked the stage, the federal courtroom in Baltimore. Judge Coleman was on the bench, the lawyers were ready to begin. Mr. Piper, who brought Mr. Davis into the case, had calmly and efficiently listed the amount of time each lawyer should take to discuss the problem of unconstitutionality—and then, one after another, unforeseen troubles knocked Mr. Davis' plans into a cocked hat.

A new trouble-maker had appeared—John J. Burns. Though young, he had already been a judge in Massachusetts, and was now chief counsel of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which was to enforce the holding-company law. He told the judge and the company of distinguished lawyers that he had some preliminary remarks to make. Mr. Piper, the Baltimore lawyer who had brought Mr. Davis into the case and was now the master of ceremonies in the court proceeding, was all courtesy and acquiescence.

Burns picked up some legal papers and began to read. In tones so quiet as to be at times almost colorless, he read and on, for forty-five minutes. But it was soon clear that there was plenty of color in what he was saying. Within five minutes, he had suggested that the court ought to investigate the circumstances of the participation in this lawsuit of Mr. Davis' client. This came startlingly close to reflecting on Mr. Davis himself. The lawyers were deeply shocked that any question should be raised about a man so likable personally and so distinguished at the bar, one-time Solicitor General of the United States, one-time ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Court of St. James, now head of the law firm whose principal client is J. P. Morgan and Company.

Worse was to come, and did. Burns asked the court to make a "thorough investigation in order to ascertain whether or not these proceedings are collusive . . . and whether or not these are fictitious petitions. . . ." He questioned "the good faith of the parties" and suggested that they had possibly engaged in an effort "to abuse the processes of this court."

As soon as Burns finished, he received one lecture from the judge and another from Davis. Said the latter, with passion:

"As I listened to the astounding approach to this court . . . I wondered if I understood exactly what the room is in which we are assembled. . . . I say, measuring my words, that the so-called suggestions . . . would have been offensive to the dignity of a police court. . . . They stoop to seize a handful of mud in each hand. . . . I say it is an unworthy, an undignified and contemptible presentation. And when I realize it comes from the official representatives and arm of the government of the citizens, then on bended knee I pray 'God save . . . the people of these United States.'"

II

An ordinary lawyer, admonished by judge and by distinguished counsel, might have let the matter drop. But Burns, despite his quiet manner and amiable appearance, refused to withdraw. He repeated his request for an investigation. The judge finally said he would ask Burns to prove his charges, and left the impression that Burns might have to eat his words.

Lawyer after lawyer had to take the witness stand. The story, as it unrolled itself, was this: An association of holding companies hired Davis to fight the law just passed by Congress. He was visited by Piper, a Baltimore lawyer who had been attorney for a holding company and, after it became bankrupt, was appointed attorney for its bankruptcy trustees, themselves appointees of the federal judge. Piper said that this bankruptcy proceeding, in charge of Judge Coleman, presented an opportunity for an ideal test in which to have the law declared unconstitutional. The test was not to be made by so common a method as a suit by a holding company against the government, to enjoin it from enforcing the law on the ground of unconstitutionality. Instead, the bankruptcy trustees were to present a petition to the judge whose aides they were in administering the bankrupt holding company. In this petition they would ask him to direct them as to whether or not they should comply with the new statute. Their lawyer, Mr. Piper, would advise the judge that the law was unconstitutional and should not be obeyed.

Davis agreed that Piper's idea was a good one, and said he would be happy to take part in persuading Judge Coleman that the law was unconstitutional. In order to participate, Davis could go to the judge, tell him that Davis represented an association of holding companies affected by the statute, and ask permission to present their views in the test case. Davis would then have taken part as, to quote the lawyers' phrase, "a friend of the court." He would not have been a "party," or have had the right to try to influence the proceeding in the interests of his clients. Deciding to be in the case, not on sufferance, not as a mere "friend of the court," not as a by-stander, but as attorney for some "party," he told Piper that he would be willing to be in the lawsuit, provided that some bondholder of the bankrupt holding company asked him, Davis, to act as his lawyer for the purpose. Piper undertook to have a client found for Davis.

The result was to emphasize, when the facts were disclosed on the witness stand, the great value of being a "party" to the proceedings. This emphasis was regrettable, as matters turned out; for the government was not a "party," and Burns strenuously objected to a test case in which the holding com- had the coveted privilege, while the

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . can only come into the court with its hat in its hand. It had no control over the proceeding. It will not be allowed to appeal. . . . If there is any lack of sportsmanship, it is on the part of the holding-company executives, who will not bring out a straight out and out adversary issue." He objected to this "procedural strategy" and to "a test case . . . in which they may leave hanging in mid-air the government, with no right to appeal." Burns insisted that the inquiry into Davis' appearance in the case go deeper, and asked for Davis' client, so that he might be questioned.

This led to more embarrassment for the holding-company side. It now appeared that Davis did not know where his client was, or who he was, and had never seen him. This in itself was not unusual; a client employed a lawyer, and the lawyer in turn consulted a big specialist. But it also developed that Piper, who was to find some bondholder to act as Davis' client, had never seen the client. Burns said this made him all the more anxious to see the man for whom Davis had come to court.

The client was found. He was a Baltimore dentist. Piper got the dentist for Davis by telling a broker to find some bondholder of the bankrupt holding company. The broker delegated the duty to another broker, who telephoned the dentist, and asked him to sign a paper. He said, in his testimony: "I asked why I was called to sign it, and after I signed it they sort of smiled and said, 'Well, you are the only one in Baltimore owned any of it.'"

Burns wanted to know who would pay Davis. Piper had already made the claim that the fact that Davis was also attorney for the holding companies was "immaterial." Burns directed his attention to the dentist. The witness said he never arranged to pay any lawyer. He said he had not even retained a lawyer. Davis was not his lawyer. Nobody told the dentist that Davis was to be his lawyer. The broker had simply "said something" [this was the dentist's testimony in court] "about a Mr. Davis being in town representing the company." The client had never met Davis, did not know him, was not going to pay him, was not his client.

When Burns said "That's all," Davis took the witness in hand. Hadn't he been told that Davis would represent him? "Not me," was the reply, "the company." Finally Davis asked his client whether he would now authorize him to argue the case, and the client yielded to the distinguished advocate. So the facts were left. Davis was now in the case with what he called a *"locus standi,"* while the government had nothing to stand on, and remained in mid-air. Burns wanted to know whether the government could still get in as a party, so that he might also get a *locus standi.* Piper said the government could not get in.

Piper, attorney for holding companies, represented the bankruptcy trustees, who were parties to the test case. Davis, attorney for a group of holding companies, represented a bondholder who was holding-company [illegible] also a party [illegible]

in arguing that the law was unconstitutional. Was there no party in this test case who would argue for the statute? There was, they said. They pointed to a corporation named Burco, Inc. Burco had been organized by a New York stockbroker, and Burco and the broker had interlocking relations with International Utilities Corporation. Indeed, Burco's attorney, who was going to fill the vacancy which had to be filled so that some party would be on the constitutionality side of the test case, was also attorney for International Utilities Corporation. Burns claimed that such facts indicated that the Burco corporation was really on Davis' side, not against him. Burns also argued that Burco had filed its court petition simultaneously with Davis' and Piper's petitions, and had accepted as correct statements made by Davis and Piper as the basis for the test case—statements which Burns said were in fact untrue. He said that this tended to throw the case to Davis and Piper, and that the result was not alone to keep out the government, the appropriate defender of the statute, but also to substitute as defender of the law a stockbroker's corporation which really wanted to defeat the law.

Burco's lawyer insisted that he was in the case to support the constitutionality of the statute because this would help the Burco corporation financially; but Burns questioned the theory elaborated by Burco's lawyer in support of this contention. The latter admitted that he had in fact been opposed to the statute while it was being debated in Congress. But now he was a sincere supporter of the law, he said. "I have given the matter considerable thought," he testified, "and I have considerable interest in the welfare of my country, and have shown it several times, I hope, and when I feel I am wrong about a thing I begin to lean the other way." Burns asked him: "What were the factors that you now recollect as effecting that change of mind?" Piper was troubled that his opponent, the Burco lawyer, should be burdened with such a question, and promptly objected: "Your Honor, is that a proper question?" But Piper was unable to succor Burco's lawyer, who was on the witness stand, and had to answer. He said: "I don't know." Piper helped him out with this comment: "It is pretty hard to answer." And the witness seized on this, saying: "It is pretty hard to answer. I can't tell."

The witness claimed that when the holding-company bill became law, he concluded that it was constitutional. To be sure, as he testified, he reached this conclusion "perhaps reluctantly." He remains the only attorney with the *locus standi* to champion the law against the attacks of Davis and Piper.

T. R. B.

P. S. While this article was in press, Judge Coleman decided, after hearing the arguments of the counsel representing the companies, but not the argument of any government attorney, that the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They Cry "Peace, Peace"

III: *Neutrality Is Not Enough*

IN TWO previous articles in The New Republic (issues of October 23 and November 6) I advanced an argument that may be summarized as follows:

1. Recent events have disheartened, confused and divided American pacifists because most of them have put their trust in the League of Nations only to discover that the League is powerless to change the national policies of any of the Great Powers.

2. Since it is now all but universally agreed that the chief causes of war, indirect as well as direct, are economic in character, proposals are beginning to be heard for redistribution of colonies and raw materials in order to restore the balance between the "sated" and the "hungry" nations and thus preserve peace. But it is delusive to suppose that the existing governments of any of the great imperialist powers would consent to such a thing, or that peace would be preserved even if they did.

3. The chief economic cause of war is the struggle of private capitalism in the industrialized nations to solve its internal problem by selling abroad its surplus goods, which tend to increase in quantities at the same time that world markets tend to shrink. The only permanent path to peace therefore lies through national and international control of all export trade, with the exports and imports of each country roughly in balance.

4. This in turn necessitates control of domestic production as well, with restrictions on the number of producers in each type of commodity and the annual productivity of each unit. Since this would severely restrict the possibilities of profit, it must be accompanied by governmental protection for labor, with specified maximum working hours and minimum wages. This would mean a long step toward socialized industry, and one that certainly would be followed by other steps in the same direction.

Assuming this argument, what likelihood is there that the American pacifist movement is prepared to support such drastic proposals? And if it is, what specific program is desirable in view of the world situation at the moment?

A striking fact about American pacifism is that it is highly compartmented at the present time. All sorts of groups exist, some of which have no contact with one another. It is important to note that the movement is partly the result of subsidization by rich men. Several millionaires have in the past

national peace. It is obvious that a group of directors of such an enterprise who are called together at the behest of some philanthropist will operate with less enthusiasm, less concentrated purpose and with more caution and formality than a group that is self-created and proceeds under its own power. Some of the peace organizations of this sort have in the course of years all but disappeared from the country's consciousness; others, feeling the responsibility of administering vast endowments, have grown extremely conservative in their operations. They try—save the mark!—to steer clear of "controversial" questions; they indulge in research whose results practically nobody ever sees; they foster those feeblest and most inane of all enterprises, international "good-will" junkets and posturings. If it may be argued that these peace groups do no particular harm, it must also be conceded that they certainly do no good.

Another large classification comes under the heading of emotional pacifists, those who feel that if only we can get enough people, and especially enough Americans, imbued with the idea that war is horrible, maybe it will stop. I have no wish to seem unkind to individuals whose sincerity and devotion are in many cases beyond question, but it seems to me that this whole fight may now be regarded as won, so far as this country is concerned, and is on a front that was never of primary importance. The magazine advertisements and speeches and motion pictures which show that a great many people are killed in war, that once killed they are permanently dead, and that death on the battlefield takes most agonizing forms, are after all somewhat beside the point. For example, the European countries that lost most heavily in the Great War, the countries where nearly every family sacrificed one or more members, directly or indirectly, are the very ones most heavily armed, most overwhelmingly militaristic today. If the horrors of war are no deterrent to peoples who have met them full face only half a generation ago, how can we hope to make these horrors a decisive factor for those who, like the Americans, got only a faint salt taste of the bitter brew of Mars? It is obvious, too, that such propaganda cannot stop war unless it has been effective in the countries of all the probable belligerents alike; and today it is blockaded by government action in those lands that are most likely to precipitate war in the future—Germany, Italy and Japan, to name only three. A cynic might even argue that since war is probable, it may be a mistake to [illegible] the prospective soldiers on one side when

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To a large degree, this sort of emotional pacifism in America is a subdivision of the woman's-club phenomenon. What the man-eating shark is to the timid editorial writer, pacifism is to spiritually unemployed, middle-aged ladies in many and many an American small town. Unlike local charity work, it leads to no serious drain on the pocketbook; unlike the study of, and active participation in, industrial relations, it brings you under no damning charge of "radicalism." While here and there it may produce a brush with the local post of the American Legion, such episodes rarely have any serious repercussions. It provides an enormous market for anti-war speeches, both by local volunteers and paid semi-professionals from the larger cities. As I have said, I do not for a moment question the sincerity and earnestness of all this activity, and on the whole it is probably somewhat more effective than the efforts of the specialized foundations. For the reasons indicated, however, no permanent hopes of peace can be built upon efforts conducted on this plane.

The third important classification in American pacifism is the one which, on the whole, seems to me the most hopeful. It is the pacifism of the rising generation, reflected most notably today in the colleges. While not all the participants in this movement are equal in sincerity and realism, they include thousands of young men and women who have gone far beyond the shallow emotionalism of conscientious objection, to an understanding of the forces that make for war, and to a willingness to participate in the changes necessary to curb these forces, no matter how far-reaching such changes may be. These young people—or many of them—will not flinch and fail in the crisis as the older pacifists are almost sure to do.

It is obvious that the ideas of this third group of pacifists are in large measure identical with those of American radicalism in general. In this movement, however, we find somewhat the same division and confusion that exist among the pacifists as a whole. An important section of American radicalism, namely, the communist movement, is for obvious reasons tied up emotionally with Soviet Russia, and the Russian government, fearing attack both by Japan and Germany, has for the sake of its security, and for no other reason, joined the League of Nations and made what is in fact a military alliance with France. The Russians are supporting the League policy of sanctions against Italy, hoping that this policy may result in stopping the Ethiopian affair, or at least in preventing the spread of the conflict and the danger that they may be forced in. For those who are surprised to see Russian Communists, their American sympathizers and the British Tory government all supporting one policy in international affairs, the answer is that the Russians are fighting for their lives and that desperation, like politics, makes strange bedfellows.

This is probably the clue also to [illegible]

supporting the policy of using collective force to maintain peace. Consciously or unconsciously, the Laborites are clinging to the hope that somehow out of Geneva may come guarantees against a future British war with Germany or, more remotely, with France, a war conducted primarily in the air, in which the British population, whatever the outcome, would experience indescribable suffering. Those Americans who believe that preservation of the Soviet Union is the most important possible policy for radicals in all countries are entitled to respectful consideration of their views; but it is obvious that theirs is not and will not be the major consideration for realistic American pacifism as a whole.

The same thing is true of the attitude of the simple pro-League group, on the whole conservative in its point of view, a group which, closing its eyes to all the realities of the past fifteen years, demands that the United States should either join the League at once or at least immediately participate openly and fully in League sanctions "in the interest of world peace." The tide in America is clearly running the other way. It is running in favor of neutrality for this country, not on any narrow basis of *sauve qui peut,* save yourselves and let the world go hang, but on the basis that every nation that can be kept out of any war is so much gained for the future of all mankind.

What should be the program, then, of those Americans who want not only to keep the United States out of conflict now, but to do what they can to abolish war itself? Naturally, there are two sets of objectives, one of which calls for immediate action, while the other is more remote (though not so distant, perhaps, as many people suppose).

In the second of these fields, the pacifists will support every activity, at home or abroad, tending to limit the power of private capitalist enterprise to create international tension. They will aid by all the means at their command the creation of governments, in all countries, far enough to the left to support such efforts. They themselves will try to understand, and then to help others to understand, the realities of present-day international relationships, in order not to be misled by statesmen whose speeches look in one direction and their actions in another.

In the field of more immediate activity, there are problems of great urgency to be faced. The pacifists should certainly work for the rewriting of the neutrality law as early as possible in the next session of Congress, to provide for the automatic interruption of all commercial and financial contact with all belligerents upon the outbreak of hostilities. If by January the Italo-Ethiopian war is still in progress (which seems to me unlikely) and if the League is still engaged in its timid and partial application of sanctions to Italy as the aggressor, the Americ[illegible]

LICENSED TO UMI. ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peace and not by the wish to aid the members of the old European Alliance against the remnants of the old Entente, which is what the League's present efforts amount to.

Equally urgent, and perhaps even more so, is the necessity that American pacifists should bring pressure to bear on our government's Far Eastern policy. They should fight for a change in the character of our navy from an offensive to a defensive weapon, and seek to prevent our entering upon the forthcoming naval-building race, a race which even the admirals can defend only on the basis of the intention to fight for our so-called interests in all parts of the world. The pacifists should resist to the utmost the desperate efforts now being made behind the scenes to bring the United States into a naval alliance with Great Britain for the purpose of "preserving peace throughout the world"—*i.e.*, maintaining the status quo in the Orient, where British interests exceed our own by at least ten to one. They should help bring home to the American people as a whole that we are now spending about a billion dollars a year on current and future military establishments that can have only one conceivable purpose—to be used against Japan in the interest of our Far Eastern trade and investments. They should emphasize the point that war would ruin both trade and investments for at least a generation in any case, to say nothing of the fact that Japan is herself our best Oriental customer, and that such a war in the Far East would almost inevitably spread until it became a general conflict, which probably would finish the work of destroying civilization, begun by the last one.

I do not see how anyone, on a basis of the facts, can be very optimistic about the chance of avoiding another world war, or series of them, during the next few decades. Certainly I am not. It seems to me, if the phrase is not too much an Irishism, that we have only a fighting chance at best. The road away from war, as I see it, is enormously difficult, nearly impassable; I am not surprised that many faint hearts quail and turn away from it. I point it out because, in my opinion, it is the only one.

BRUCE BLIVEN.

Underground

Now imminent on earth the enemy in tunics: hussars
have taken the mainlands.
It is the lost season west of the red star but our
years
Rumble on caissons—subterrain, the single muscle,
the manifold heart.

Berlin applauds at the opera. The war below gives
passwords
Through quiet doors—the press turns urgently in
oil.
Nights are alive ten paces under Brandenburg Gate:
mornings rise
Between bayonets—but the walls speak. They will
break the bronze horses.

Herr Strauss relieves the capital: wine is taken in
Vienna
Boldly by light, the howitzers drawn in the lair.
Yet they remember
The Karl Marx—the detonations still in ghostly
Floridsdorf:
They build now, from their black base upward, on
sturdier rock.

Hussars on Caesar's road, but there are seven hills in
Rome,
The guardsmen dream at intervals. They spread fire
in the dark,
Knowing the jagged forum dead, seeing no god great
in the empire.

Cleverly again the castanets, Seville nods on its
balconies.
Music after burial in Asturias, but they listen in the
mines
For messenger from Madrid. Spain basks, muzzle to
Africa:
City and land drum their own anthem heavily under
night.

The generals lift two-handled swords. The guns too
may utter both ways.
No lantern is under Tokio, no cherry blossom falls
upon thinkers
Of dangerous thoughts: but they breathe equally in
dark orchards;
Some stars yield light below—tomorrow they stand on
the terraces.

Heads stare from the gateposts of the river cities:
yet they salute
In the basements of Tientsin, sub-Canton will issue
steel.
They die by the hundred cuts, but nocturnal papers
pass in the market place.
They know death who sleep at the Yellow River: the
dragon will disturb his ash.

Now imminent on earth the enemy in tunics: hussars
have taken the mainlands.
It is the lost season west of the red star but our
years
Rumble on caissons—subterrain, the single muscle,
the manifold heart.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mussolini: Megalomaniac

An Uncensored Letter from Rome

ON THE surface Italy seems to be united behind Mussolini and the Ethiopian adventure. No other modern government has equaled the showmanship and internal propaganda displayed by the Fascist state during the last few weeks. The nationwide mobilization on the afternoon of October 2 was an amazing and terrifying performance. The sirens sounded as the daily siesta closed and all over Italy the members of the Fascist Party and the Fascist Youth moved toward their local headquarters. Within the hour they were on the march toward the local squares where the assemblies were to be held. Martial music was bellowed forth by loud speakers, while squadrons of low-flying airplanes droned overhead.

In Rome by five-thirty P. M. 200,000 spectators had already crowded into the Piazza Venezia and here within the next hour 100,000 Blackshirts marched under perfect discipline. Then, with the stage set and with torches flaring from all the buildings around the Piazza, Il Duce, in a soldier's uniform and a tin hat, stepped out on the balcony of the Palazzo Venezia and into the spotlight. Looking over to the huge monument of Victor Emanuel, which in the dusk had lost most of its hideousness, he gazed down the Via dell' Impero, past the Republican and Imperial Fora to the Coliseum. Strengthened by these witnesses to the power of Rome, he plunged into a fighting speech which, given its purposes, was a masterpiece. At the end of every paragraph he stepped back to let his words be absorbed by the twenty millions throughout the country who listened to the blaring loud speakers. He would pause for a moment with hand on hips like a stocky condottiere of the fifteenth century and then step forward and bark out his next paragraph.

In the days that have followed, events have moved swiftly. On the next morning came the advance into Ethiopia, which the official communiqué and the entire press gravely declared to be provoked by Ethiopian aggression and to have been hastened by the nefarious action of that country in withdrawing its troops thirty kilometers from the frontier! Radio, press, the cinema and the armed forces are all used to prove that Italy, Fascism and Mussolini are one and that it is a unified country which marches its columns into Ethiopia and defies the League.

But underneath the surface there is no such solid enthusiasm except for the Fascist Youth who were too young for the last war and have been carefully trained to glorify the next. In the movie houses, few cheers greet the display of the Italian militar[illegible] maneuvers or the appearance of the Dictator himself. The older men who wear the Fascist button speak privately with perfect frankness of the foolhardiness of the venture. The women, whom Mussolini exhorts to "salute their husbands, sons and lovers firmly" and send them on, are restive at the prospect of losing their men. The rich merchants, shopkeepers and hotel proprietors, who depend so largely upon foreign trade, see ruin facing them and are not happy. Even in Rome, filled as it is with the military and with the bureaucracy, the underlying sentiment is not pro-war, while in Genoa and along the Ligurian coast, where the democratic traditions of Mazzini and Garibaldi are still powerful, the opposition is naturally more intense. In Naples and the south, crowds cheer the dominant group publicly and then as ever grumble beneath their breath. There is everywhere a general feeling that Italy may indeed be moving toward disaster.

There are few among the intellectuals who believe the assigned reason for the war to be sufficient —namely, that it is waged to provide an outlet for the growing population. For while the population is growing at the rate of half a million a year and while emigration has been shut off by the policies of the United States, the South American countries and France, Ethiopia certainly cannot take care of any large number. The lowlands of that country cannot be lived in at all by Europeans, while the mountain plateaus will do well if they accommodate 100,000 Italian peasants.

Against the scanty benefits of conquest must be set the heavy costs of conquering a country in which the chief enemies of the Italians, as the general staff has well realized, will be the sun, fever and dysentery, even more than the general warfare of the Ethiopians themselves. Not only will the human costs of the war be heavy, but so too will the financial costs. The Fascist regime has been running heavy deficits throughout the last thirteen years and these have been mounting rapidly during the depression, so that the burden of accumulated interest plus the other expenses of government is crushing. The expense of maintaining 250,000 troops in the field and at least an equal number at home may become impossible. Certainly the signs of incipient inflation are everywhere and prices are rising.

The Ethiopian game, therefore, is not worth the candle, even though the League were to take no effective action. What then has caused Mussolini

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

having severe economic and possibly military sanctions as well applied against him by the nations of the League?

The prevalent belief abroad is that the adventure was originally favored by Mussolini as a means of diverting popular attention from the severe internal crisis. There is probably something to this, but certainly not so much as is commonly thought by foreigners. In comparison with wages, which average for the country 1.75 lire an hour, or a little less than nine cents gold, the cost of living is high. It takes on the average an hour's work to buy two pounds of bread, as it does to purchase each of the following: a pound and a half of spaghetti, a pint of wine and six ounces of meat, fish or cheese. Tea, coffee, sugar and butter are amazingly high and are out of the reach of the working class. It requires over a day's work to buy a shirt in Rome and nearly a week's labor to rent one room in a working-class neighborhood for a month. It is natural, therefore, despite the historically low living standards of Italian labor, that popular discontent should have risen during the last year as prices have advanced. But the regime was in no such desperate straits as to be driven to resort to a foreign war in order to stay in power. The opposition was and is inarticulate and diffused. With all the force concentrated in its hands, Fascism was relatively safe and in fact far more secure than it will be should the war turn out unsuccessfully.

The primary reason for the war seems to lie instead in the unsettling effect that extreme nationalism and limitless power have upon the sanity and sense of balance of a dictator. For fifteen years Mussolini has exalted the glories of war and Italy's alleged mission to expand by conquest. He has built up a powerful army and an armed Fascist militia. His airplanes fill the heavens. He has dressed, talked and acted for almost a generation as a bellicose soldier who was anxious for war, and it is but natural that this should in time carry him away as it has thousands of his younger followers.

All this has, moreover, been fed by the intense flattery that inevitably surrounds a dictator. It is not the Fascist Party that controls Italy. It is Mussolini who controls both party and country. Those who worship power as such and those who wish to gain their personal ends give him adulation in slavish terms. As a result, even if a man were sane when he took power, he would rather quickly develop a supreme confidence in his own infallibility and exhibit all the delusions of grandeur that in a humbler personage would mark him out for psychopathic treatment. For, as Lord Acton once remarked, and as the experience of absolute monarchy confirms: "All power corrupts and absolute power corrupts . . . absolutely." There is a story going surreptitiously around Rome that expresses the popular feeling upon this point. It is that a French professor of chemistry who had been brought to Rome to advise the government on poison gases was received in Venezia which Mussolini uses as an office. After being introduced, Mussolini let the professor stand for half an hour while he went on with some work. At last he looked up and, seeing his guest still standing, asked, "Well, can you tell me which is the most dangerous and overpowering gas?" To this the savant is supposed to have answered, "Incense!"

It is probable that this incident never happened and that the story is a folk-myth. But it is even more significant as such since it expresses what a growing number of Italians feel to be the disease that menaces Italy.

The evidences of this disease are everywhere. Virtually the only name that is allowed to appear in the newspapers and certainly the only face and name on the posters is that of Il Duce. No one else is allowed to obtain great repute or appreciable publicity lest he become a potential rival. Thus the shrewd D'Annunzio finds it worth his while to remain in seclusion in his villa. Grandi is demoted when he makes too favorable an impression upon the world at Geneva, and the protesting Balbo, as a reward for his epoch-making flight to America, is relegated to innocuous desuetude in Africa and deprived of any connection with the active air force. The result is that persons with independent minds are either weeded out of public office or ignored. The secretaryship of the Fascist Party is given to Starace, who has learned his lesson so well that when he visits a city he is always careful to announce that the popular acclaim is not for him but for Il Duce. There is undoubtedly an element of sadism in the way Mussolini dominates the Italian people, and unfortunately the nation has shown a masochistic tendency in submitting for so long to this control.

Surrounded thus by the flatterers and with apparently complete power in his hands, it is small wonder that Mussolini should after a time decide that he, like the Caesars of old, could control other nations as well as his own and that the time has come, in his fifties, to do in Ethiopia what the Japanese had been able to carry off successfully in Manchuria. It is an open secret in Italy that the tacticians of the general staff have steadily advised against the venture and that in consequence the campaign has been virtually taken over by Mussolini himself.

No one of course can prophesy what the future holds. The stiffening of the League, combined with the natural difficulties of the Ethiopian campaign, indicate, however, that the results may indeed be disastrous for Italy. If they are, then despite their present power, Fascism and Mussolini will almost inevitably crumble. What could not be done by internal opposition alone can result from foreign pressure and external failure. It is difficult, indeed, to see how the downfall of the dictatorship can occur in any other way and, by a turn of poetic justice, it may thus have chosen the one sure way itself. If a sufficient check is therefore

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

administered to the Italian dictatorship at this time, we may witness the recession of that tide of fascism which has threatened to engulf the free institutions of the world. The Greek tragedians would see in all this the sure workings of implacable fate. The modern student of government instead sees laid bare before his eyes a crucial weakness of all inflamed nationalism and personal dictatorships.

Rome, Italy. FOREIGN OBSERVER.

The Machines

A Story

NEAR OUR house in Fresno there were stretches of bare land and some of this land was fenced in and contractors stored planks, trucks and derricks in the enclosures. During boom times the equipment was always busy and the men were continually going to and from the yards; and the derricks were no sooner stored than they were being taken away and used somewhere else where a building was being erected. But when the boom passed, the machinery remained idle in the lots for long periods at a time and began to rust. Some of the contractors even went broke and the power shovels and the derricks were not tended by watchmen, as if the equipment had suddenly lost all value.

"Such waste," my mother used to say. "Look how they used to puff and now they are just rusting away."

With the scoop bent to the ground, the steam shovels had a pathetic look—neck broken, head bowed in shame. At nights when they were shapes in the darkness, the decay was particularly tragic. The derricks craned their necks against the sky. An air of sadness hovered over the yards.

"Just think of the holes they could dig," my mother would say. "Even we could use one. (We had an outhouse in the back yard.) One big mouthful and the work would be done for a year."

The machines rusted away and when after several years men did come to make use of them, the joints were so rust-bound that the treads protested with loud squeaks at any effort made to move them.

"They have been lazy so long," my mother remarked, "that they don't want to go to work." And she laughed at this. "When they are ready to work, no one wants them, and when they have grown accustomed to loafing, somebody comes along and pokes them. Up! To work! Why are you sitting? Even big cold machines have their troubles."

Finally after much effort, the machines were given up as junk and a junk man came in a truck and proceeded to dismantle them and haul them away. The pieces were so large that only small parts could be moved at a time and it took weeks to clear the yards. Even after the machines were gone, the ground where they had stood was stained with grease and oil—the droppings of [illegible]

Every time we looked at the yards, we used to remember the machines and laugh. How perfect they were. One scoop and the work of twenty men was done in an instant. All this allowed to go to waste. "If I had them," my brother said, "I'd dig caves all over the country."

Later we moved and the yards were forgotten.

Life at most is not very certain. You are happy and then you are unhappy. You are working and then you are not working. That is the way it goes.

I am now a member of the unemployed. I am not complaining. Whose fault is it? I don't know. (I have my ideas.)

Lately I have been looking for work, but not with much success. People promise things, offer hopes, but nothing for now, sorry.

All this doesn't discourage me. I keep going out and looking for jobs. There is charity. We get along.

As a matter of fact, instead of being discouraged, I am amused. It is ridiculously funny. Somehow, every time I go out looking for work, I think of the machines that used to be in the lots back home.

Here I am, over six feet tall. I have big, laborer's hands and feet. I have hair on my chest and a heavy nose. I am nothing but a worker and I look it. I go from place to place: "Any work today? No? Well, I'll come again tomorrow."

I don't get angry. I just laugh. "Some day you'll have something," I say. I make the rounds and then go home.

"See," I tell my wife, "how funny it is? Here I am, a machine. My joints work, my arms swing. I can lift three hundred pounds. (I lift her high to show her. She weighs 115). I can shout ("Yes," she agrees, "especially if there is nothing to eat.") and I can curse: gosh, shucks, gee-whiz. I'm a real he-man and I'm all ready to go to work, but there is nothing for me to do. My brain works, I can philosophize and accept my troubles. (In a hundred years we will all be dead.) I can talk, gesticulate, stamp my feet. Yet for all this, there is no use. I am just like those machines in the lot back home."

At night I go to bed and dream about the machines, sad in the darkness. There I am. There is the human race.

Send us to wars, let us kill each other off. Keep us on charity and in a few years' time economic disturbances will take their toll. Dissect us, cart us away.

I was swinging my arms in my excitement and one of my joints creaked.

"Did you hear that?" I said to my wife. "See, even I am rusting."

She laughed at me. She is always laughing at me. She thinks I am a radical, but I am not.

Let us rust then. Let us stand with our necks broken. What trouble someone is going to have one day when he tries to put us to work. "Work? What is that?" we'll say. "Don't bother me I'm

DIGITIZED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Plans for the Coming Naval Conference—
The Air Power Problem Remains—
A Setback for LaGuardia

THE Navy Department takes the approach of a new naval conference with great calm. Within a few days, Admiral Standley and the American delegation will sail for London, and so far there has been no flood of navy propaganda about our comparative defenselessness and the menace of Japan. Incredibly, we seem to have a set of satiated admirals.

The object of the administration at the conference will be to persuade Japan to agree to the present status for another five years. Since the 1930 naval conference, the Japanese have been demanding equality—something that this country, for no comprehensible reason, has refused to grant. Japan will not sign a treaty acknowledging our present superiority, and, accordingly, the Washington and London treaties will be allowed to lapse. This will mark the end of the chief attempt in modern times to limit armaments, and will be a moral disaster of the first order. However, a procedure has been devised to salvage as much of the treaties as possible. After negotiation, each country is to announce the building program that it feels corresponds to its national importance, strategic needs and the length of its admirals' whiskers. The nations will be expected to abide by these programs, and a naval race may perhaps be forestalled.

The special advantage of this procedure, from the standpoint of our Navy Department, is that both Japan and the United States already possess building programs. If the Japanese present a sudden demand for ships not contemplated by their existing schedules, they will automatically place themselves in an embarrassing diplomatic position. The American delegates can say that, in consonance with Mr. Roosevelt's good-neighbor policy, we do not wish a single ship beyond those already building or authorized, and the onus of preventing an agreement can be put upon Japan.

A great part of our present naval superiority lies in our battleships, which helps to explain why Japanese and British admirals consider the battleship an outworn, useless weapon, while American admirals consider it irreplaceable. Nearly all Japanese and British battleships were laid down shortly after the outbreak of the World War. Because we did not enter the War until 1917, our battleships are newer by four or five years, and incorporate the knowledge gained in the battle of Jutland. Japan has only two ships, the "Musta" and the "Nagato," that were commissioned after 1918. The United States has six, and naval experts generally agree that two of them, the "West Virginia" and the "Colorado," outclass by a wide margin any possessed by Japan.

In cruisers, this country has also gained by its tardiness. The power of the Japanese military and naval clans, after their eclipse at the end of the World War, began to be partially restored about 1927. Japan then began to build delayed, first on account of the London naval conference in 1930, and then because of the world disarmament conference in 1932. Only when Mr. Roosevelt raided the original P.W.A. fund did our cruiser program get under way. The result is that while Japan has fourteen heavy cruisers in commission, it has none under construction or appropriated for. The United States has sixteen in commission and three building. In light cruisers, Japan has twenty in commission, five building and one appropriated for. We have ten in commission, seven building and two appropriated for. Because Japan was the first country to build post-World War cruisers, its designers had to do a pioneering job, and, in the opinion of many experts, turned out ships that are topheavy and easy to hit in comparison with the later ships of America and England.

It is reported here that the Japanese naval leaders, delighted to be rid of the treaties they thought branded Japan as inferior, will agree to a continuation of the present status. But even if the Japanese show themselves conciliatory at London, it will not mean that the military problem between them and the United States has been solved. In the last year, we have begun to build air bases in Alaska, and an American company has opened an air route across the Pacific. On their side, the Japanese are supposed to be planning the construction of air bases in their mandated South Sea islands. A problem in air power is thus being created that is likely to be as dangerous as that of naval rivalry.

One interesting result of last week's elections was the indirect repudiation of Mayor LaGuardia of New York City. LaGuardia threw his full strength behind former Controller McGoldrick, who ran for district attorney in Brooklyn, and was defeated by about 150,000 votes. Thirteen Republican aldermen, nominally LaGuardia supporters, were likewise beaten by Tammany and its allies.

The national significance of this defeat lies in the fact that many observers believe it was caused, in part, by the non-success of the Roosevelt work-relief program. LaGuardia is a member of the W. P. A. advisory board. Because of his aggressiveness and perseverance, the work-relief program was put into effect in New York, under General Hugh S. Johnson, several weeks before funds were allotted to the rest of the country. Politically, the effect should have been to raise LaGuardia to a municipal hero. Viewing their fellow citizens happily engaged on socially useful projects, New Yorkers ought to have rushed to vote for any candidate favored by their mayor. In fact, they did nothing of the kind.

The unemployed in New York City are comparatively well organized, and their rank-and-file leaders have protested vigorously against many aspects of the work-relief program. The municipal relief workers, with their great influence over individual unemployed families, have also severely criticized the program and the way in which it has been administered. Faced with the loss of their own jobs by the wholesale transfer of the unemployed from home relief to work relief, they have openly quarreled with LaGuardia. Two years ago, LaGuardia had the esteem, even affection, of all New Yorkers except the very rich. Without conciliating the rich, he is now rapidly alienating [illegible] Th[illegible] Roosevelt administration has built

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great political hopes upon the work-relief program. If it proves no more popular elsewhere in the country than it has in New York City—the only place in which it is in full operation—it will be of little help to Mr. Roosevelt in the coming campaign.

LaGuardia's present difficulties have an ironical side. Under Coolidge and Hoover, LaGuardia was the acknowledged left-wing leader in the House. When he left Washington to become mayor, he chose Vito Marcantonio, then only thirty-three, to succeed him. Marcantonio is now the chief strategist and spokesman for the New York City relief workers, and his arguments for more generous relief measures are essentially those that LaGuardia himself once valiantly upheld.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Fixed and Not So Fixed Trusts—Shed a Tear for NBC—Judge Healy Gets Another Job

OUR OLD friends, the investment trusts, are finally about to be investigated. It is about five years since we looked them over in the pages of this magazine. I have some priceless clippings from what are known as business and financial journals commenting on the series of articles written in 1930 on the shameless racket that the high and low in Wall Street were running then. The articles were looked upon as something combining pitiful ignorance and pitiless irreverence. But within a year hundreds of thousands of investors had realized several billions in losses. The management trust got into very bad repute. Indeed, there came a time when the name of Goldman-Sachs was good for a laugh even in a burlesque house.

The next phase in this folly was the fixed trust. The management trusts had revealed that the so-called management arising out of the business brains of the Wall Street bankers was something less valuable than the hit or miss direction of the most uninformed tyro in Wall Street. No one lost more money in the crash than those who had paid handsomely for the management brains of the racketeers who ran investment trusts. And so, about 1932, a new racket appeared on the scene. It was sold on the theory that Wall Street management was something worse than useless. In fact the shining virtue of the fixed trust was that there was no management in it at all. The salesmen who had been going around to their victims in 1928 selling them trust shares on the assurance that the investment was going to be directed by the best Wall Street brains were now going around to the same people selling them fixed-trust shares on the assurance, the guarantee, that these brilliant brains could not possibly have anything to do with the investment. The investment was supposed to be management-proof. There would be no management. A portfolio of shares would be selected and fixed irrevocably for twenty years.

This did not go down so well. It had failed signally in 1922 and 1923 with the original bankers' shares trusts. S[illegible] of gadget lovers and a new gadget was invented for the trusts. That is, a clause was inserted into the fixed-trust shares that would make them not so fixed. Recognizing that some of the shares might turn very sour in twenty years and that, therefore, to make the sale of them by the trust impossible would be inviting certain loss, a device was invented under which the trust would be automatically relieved of certain undesirable shares at the proper moment. It was the most amazing piece of folly I have ever encountered in Wall Street. It was an almost certain guarantee of loss and of course, as the market continued to sink during 1932 and 1933, many of these fixed trusts were wiped out.

These trusts came into existence in the most surprising manner. The first trusts were the work of investment bankers. These fixed trusts were the work of stockbrokers. Brokerage houses with large offices and staffs which were idle because of the depression hit upon the fixed trust as a means of putting the boys to work. And so customers' men, office clerks and others were sent out to sell fixed trusts to old clients, with a guarantee that management and brains could not touch them.

Apparently that nonsense has passed too. But the trusts are assuming a new form. What are they, as we pointed out five years ago, but splendid mechanisms for creating and controlling enormous reservoirs of other people's money which can be used to buy shares and thus get control of industrial corporations? This is the form the trusts are now taking, though of course the old schemes are not wholly abandoned.

Judge Healy, as he sets out to pick his way through this jungle, will run into some old friends. Judge Healy gave to the world the picture of the National Electric Light Association, then dominated by Samuel Insull, distilling its baleful influence into the pulpit, the textbooks, the news columns. One of the gentlemen who was the instrument of this work was Mr. M. C. Aylesworth. Since Aylesworth had won his spurs as a manufacturer of propaganda, I was among those who were shocked when so big-minded a citizen as Owen D. Young picked him to be the head of the most powerful instrument for propaganda in the world—the National Broadcasting Company. The history of NBC in the field of propaganda I do not know. I am sure the good influence of Owen D. Young and David Sarnoff must have been exerted there. But now we read that NBC has come into the control of one of the new investment trusts. And Mr. Aylesworth goes with it. It is to be regretted that this potent instrumentality of communication and opinion should pass into such control.

At all events the investigation is in good hands. When Commissioner Healy of the S.E.C. is asked to investigate, he proceeds to do so. He proved that years ago when the Federal Trade Commission set him to work on the power trusts. Once started, there was no stopping him. Relentlessly, ruthlessly, month after month he dug into every cranny and corner of the industry. I don't know when the printed volumes of the reports of his work began coming into my office, but they have been coming ever since. The latest arrivals are volumes 71 to 76. Now Judge Healy is on the S.E.C. And he has been commissioned to look into the investment-trust business. We await his discov-

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the Labor Front

Bitter Pills for Bill Green—Ridding the Railroads of Company Unions—Strike-Breaker Bergoff Isn't Worried

FOLLOWING his reëlection as president of the A.F. of L., at its recent convention, William Green expressed the hope that the bitter fight between the industrial and craft unionists would be forgotten and that peace and unity would prevail. "We have come through with colors flying," he said, "and with our ranks indissoluble and intact." It was a pretty thought, but apparently the Executive Council, dominated by reactionary craft unionists, was not listening. For at its first meeting, following the close of the convention, it proceeded to demonstrate that it had no intention whatever of considering or yielding to the progressive sentiments voiced by the delegates.

It did this in part by rejecting a series of resolutions that were sponsored by progressives but which the convention did not act upon before adjournment. For example, it denied an appeal of the automobile workers for the right to elect the president of their own union—the International Union of United Automobile Workers. Thus the automobile workers must continue under Francis J. Dillon, a man in whom they have no confidence and who was appointed by President Green over their bitter protest. The Council also refused to endorse the Lundeen unemployment-insurance bill—on the ground that Congress has already enacted President Roosevelt's Social Security Act, but ignoring the fact that this measure does not provide for those who are unemployed at present.

But perhaps the best sample of the Council's frame of mind is revealed in its rejection of a resolution criticizing the anti-labor, fascist policies of the Hearst press. In taking this action it accepted wholeheartedly the conclusions of Matthew Woll's resolutions committee, which reported as follows:

> Your committee is of the opinion that a number of newspapers have shown themselves to be actively hostile to the trade-union movement, but the Hearst publications cannot be included in this category. Those who read the Hearst publications are aware that during the year they have carried a series of articles exposing the tyranny and terrorism in Russia.

As a final thrust, the Council designated William Hutcheson of the carpenters as labor delegate to the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference in Chile. Mr. Hutcheson, a violent anti-New Dealer and head of the Hoover Labor Committee in the last campaign, will be remembered as the man who lost a knock-down decision to John L. Lewis of the miners when he tried to shut off debate on industrial unionism at the convention. The approval of Mr. Hutcheson's name, within forty-eight hours after the fist fight on the convention floor, is generally regarded as a gesture of the die-hard craft unionists to prove that they are still ruling the A.F. of L. To make the proof dramatic, they selected the one man most heartily disliked by the progressives.

as either final or decisive. Last week in Washington they organized a Committee for Industrial Organization, headed by Lewis of the United Mine Workers and including the presidents of seven international unions. The purpose of the Committee is "to encourage and promote" industrial unions among the workers in the mass-production and unorganized industries. It would be difficult to overrate the importance of this program, for it may mark the beginning of a real drive to enlarge the A.F. of L. into a genuine mass-labor organization. But if this drive gets very far without terrific howls of protest—and outright obstruction—from the craft-union boys, it will be proof positive that the day of miracles has arrived. It will also mean that Bill Green's desire for a quiet, harmonious year will be fulfilled.

One of the things you have not read very much about in the daily press is the extraordinary purge of company unions that has been—and still is—taking place on the railroads. Within the past year or so, such unions have been scrapped on more than seventy-five roads, including some of the largest. The National Mediation Board, established under the Railway Labor Act, has been an important contributing factor to this rather unusual occurrence. Only recently the Board completed its poll of more than 5,000 clerks on the Santa Fé system—with the result that the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks is now the recognized agency for all clerical workers employed by the Santa Fé. This victory, according to the Brotherhood officials, removes the last company union from their craft in the entire territory west of Chicago. It is not without interest, in this connection, to note the result of the first election held under the auspices of the new National Labor Relations Board. The election involved the employees of the Simmons Furniture Company of San Francisco and resulted in a four-to-one victory for an A.F. of L. union. Where workers are given a free choice there seems little doubt that they prefer a real union to a dummy affair.

New York State has revoked the private-detective license of the Bergoff Detective Service, Inc., of which Pearl L. Bergoff, strike-breaker extraordinary, is president. But pending a federal law barring the importation of strike-breakers, it is unlikely that Mr. Bergoff's activities will be severely circumscribed. "This won't cramp my style," he told the press, "because my strike-breaking business, which won me the title of 'King of the Strike-breakers,' needs no license. I will continue with my work, remembering that for eighteen years I was a strike-breaker without a detective license."

An excellent account of Mr. Bergoff's career, and of the strike-breaking industry in general, is now available in Edward Levinson's recently published "I Break Strikes! The Technique of Pearl L. Bergoff" (McBride). Bergoff has seen service in more than 300 strikes—service in which he pulled down a profit of more than $10,000,000. During these conflicts, more than fifty persons were killed, seventeen of them strikers and twenty-two of them passengers on street cars run by Bergoff aides. But despite this record and that of a host of other strike-breaking agencies, there [illegible] effective legislation aimed at this racket.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Food for Factory Workers

SIR: My attention has been called to your editorial on page 283 of the October 23 issue of The New Republic, in which you say "A spokesman for the A.A.A. defended the increase in the cost of food, on the ground that factory earnings have increased by a slightly larger percentage; this argument of course overlooks the fact that much of the factory increase has come through reëmployment of the idle and that millions of families face higher food costs with only the same income they had one or two years ago."

Since you do not name the spokesman, I may be jumping to an erroneous conclusion that you refer to a statement which was put out by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration on October 14 entitled "Earnings of Factory Workers Keep Pace with Food Prices." If that statement is the basis for your editorial comment, may I suggest that you have completely missed the facts in that statement. The fact which you charge we overlooked was actually the substance of our statement. The statement dealt strictly with the course of earnings per employed person and contrasted the purchasing power of the earnings of the employed person in terms of food and non-food items with an entirely different condition of that part of our population which is unemployed or on relief.

I quote for your ready perusal two sentences of our statement: "As far as the employed factory worker is concerned, then, we have now a fair balance between earnings, food prices and non-food living costs. The real problem is with the unemployed, how to give them permanent employment and earnings enough to restore their former standard of living. . . ."

I trust that this will indicate to you that we have the same concern with the "reëmployment of the idle" and with the millions of unemployed who face higher food costs, that is expressed in your editorial comment.

LOUIS H. BEAN, Economic Adviser,
Washington, D. C. Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Slowing the Military March

SIR: Bills to prohibit compulsory military training in civil schools and colleges were introduced concurrently in both house of the recent Congress by Senator Gerald P. Nye and Congressman Paul J. Kvale (S. 3309 and H. R. 8950). This is the logical consequence of last December's Supreme Court decision, which ruled adversely upon the petition of two student conscientious objectors to compulsory R.O.T.C., but which stated that Congress has the power to pass laws providing exemption from military training. The introduction of these bills marks another step in the protracted struggle to obtain freedom of conscience from military domination in 118 civil colleges and schools where the R.O.T.C., furnished with federal funds, is now compulsory.

In a year when military appropriations reached high tide, it is worth pointing out that some important victories for peace have been won in the educational field. Over a period of twelve months we note the following:

1. The University of Minnesota abolished *compulsory* military training, the second "land grant" institution to do so.
2. DePauw University in Indiana began the year with the abolition of all military drill.
3. New York University (College of Arts and Sciences) announced the abolition of *compulsory* military training to begin in the fall of 1935.
4. The University of New Hampshire set a precedent in exempting six students from military training on grounds of conscientious objection.
5. Similar action was taken by Michigan State College for one student.
6. Bill H. R. 5593, initiated last February by the War Department to add two months to the enlistment period of the Civilian Conservation Corps "for the purpose of intensive military training," has been thus far blocked [illegible]
7. [illegible] ing for dismissal of anyone who criticized the college's military instruction.
8. A campaign to make military training at the University of Oregon elective rather than compulsory has received the endorsement of the State Grange, the State Federation of Labor and other influential bodies.

But at this juncture when the War Department has been given an extra million dollars to subsidize the extension of the R.O.T.C. to one hundred or more new institutions, the Committee on Militarism in Education is faced with the most serious financial crisis in its history. To continue its work, oppose new R.O.T.C. units and prepare a campaign for support of the Nye-Kvale amendment, it must have $5,000 before December 31. Financial contributions, large and small, are urgently needed now and should be sent to the Committee's office at 2929 Broadway, New York City.

GEORGE A. COE,
JOHN NEVIN SAYRE,
NORMAN THOMAS,
OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD,
New York City. For the Committee.

Two Disagreements

SIR: I am moved to protest Mr. Henry Hart's review of J. T. Salter's "Boss Rule," which appeared in your issue of September 18. . . . Mr. Hart's quotations are unfair when removed from their context. He cites some sentences that appear to be obvious generalizations—hence unworthy of a book. It is quite true that many of the ABC's of the political game are recorded here as foundation material. But upon these are built with infinite care and precision the scientific technique of the expert. That Mr. Hart happens to be familiar with the political atmosphere does not invalidate Professor Salter's record. On the contrary, the fact that the reviewer recognizes the scene at every turn, redounds to the author's credit. . . .

Philadelphia, Pa. FRANCES L. REINHOLD.

SIR: Conceding all due latitude to reviewers, may I nevertheless be permitted to dissent from Mr. Henry Hart's criticism of "Boss Rule," by J. T. Salter. Regrettably enough, Mr. Hart falls into error in his first sentence with the statement that "Professor J. T. Salter spent several years in Philadelphia at the expense of the Social Science Research Council." The truth is that Professor Salter, as an instructor at the University of Pennsylvania, spent five years without special financial assistance in the study of Vare division leaders. Later, in accordance with its policy of aiding young scholars to complete their work, he was granted a fellowship for fifteen months by the S.S.R.C. . . . Quite apart from the virtue of trustworthiness which one rather expects of critics, I am dubious as to the relevancy of Mr. Hart's assertion, as quoted, even if it had been true. Whether the author of "Boss Rule" was compensated for one or for several years' work on Philadelphia politics has little if anything to do with the merit of the book itself. . . .

Of much more serious character is Mr. Hart's second error, as follows: "He [Professor Salter] fell in with a couple of pseudo-reformers—and apparently through them met one or two ward leaders and a handful of division leaders." This is an understatement far more gross than the overstatement cited above. I am not sufficiently familiar with Professor Salter's circle of friends in Philadelphia to say how many reformers, "pseudo" or otherwise, he may happen to number among his acquaintances. I do know, however, that he went directly to machine leaders not only at the beginning of his investigation but constantly thereafter; that he met and interviewed the late William S. Vare, every member of the Republican City Committee—that is, *all* the ward leaders—and several hundred division leaders. . . .

LICENSED TO UMICH
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indictment. From the context, however, it appears that the "crime" referred to was committed by the Social Science Research Council in appointing Professor Salter to a fellowship. Mr. Hart avers that "he can give them [the S.S.R.C.] the names of half a dozen persons who will do a real study of the extraordinary interplay of economics, politics and humanity in Philadelphia." As a project for scientific research this sounds somewhat vague; no doubt, however, the S.R.R.C. would be interested, mildly, in Mr. Hart's suggestions. Meanwhile as a member of the Committee of Selection which appointed Professor Salter to his fifteen months' fellowship I wish to deprecate, with a grin, the soft impeachment of criminal intent on the part of myself or of my colleagues; also to express my thoroughgoing satisfaction with the work which he has thus helped to complete.

Although not designed as a textbook, "Boss Rule" seems to me so admirable a contribution to the field of municipal politics that I have placed it in the hands of my students at Swarthmore College. It is also being used in the same way at Yale and Columbia. Three more "crimes," no doubt!

Swarthmore, Pa. ROBERT C. BROOKS.

Why Workers Go North

SIR: I am working on a book dealing with the migration of white and Negro workers to the automobile factories in Detroit, Toledo, Flint, etc., and I am particularly interested in identifying the immediate cause of these migrations. I have been told that automobile companies, in search of cheap and docile labor, have inserted paid advertisements in Southern newspapers at the same time experienced workers were being laid off. I have also heard that bus and railroad companies advertise excursion rates, citing the chances for employment in the automobile factories. But I have not been able to unearth any specimens of such advertisting, and I should be very grateful for the chance to examine some of them. I am in search of case histories of Southern workers in the automobile industry, and have obtained a number personally, but there may be others who have a story to tell and who would not mind writing me about it. Anything in the shape of magazine or newspaper articles, letters, etc., dealing with this subject will be taken good care of and promptly returned, if sent to me at Rural Route Four, Moberly, Missouri.

Moberly, Mo. JACK CONROY.

It's an Ill Wind

SIR: Undoubtedly it would have added much interest to Oliver La Farge's already interesting article, "Revolution with Reservations" [The New Republic, October 9], if he had included how by a series of fortunate accidents the Osage tribe in Oklahoma became the richest people per capita in the world.

Briefly, when the Indians of the West were compelled to live on reservations, the Osages were given as their lot the most barren sand hills in Oklahoma, the rich valley lands already having been claimed by the whites. This was the first favorable accident.

The next was that while the government wanted to apportion the worthless land among the tribe in true white-man style, the wise old Osage chief insisted that all land within the boundaries be forever held in common by the tribe, and he gained his point. The next accident was that after many miserable years a tremendous oil pool was discovered beneath the barren hills of the reservation. And notwithstanding that the tribe got only one-eighth of the oil and that undoubtedly they were short-changed unmercifully in the handling of the huge sum that was their share, this tribe has the laugh on the whites who usurped their rich valleys and who now eke out a scanty existence thereon.

Truly this is poetic justice and the only case on record where the Indian got the best of what was intended to be a bad deal. To be sure their wealth has demoralized many of the tribe, as wealth had done even among the "superior" whites, but today as we all head for hell in a handbasket under rugged individualism, the Osage still has the edge in his comfortable car free from financial worry and a jug of joyous firewater on the seat

From The New Republic Mail Bag

The Committee to Support Southern Textile Organization announces that it is broadening the scope of its work to include Southern workers in all fields of industry and agriculture and has changed its name to the League for Southern Labor. The League plans to carry on a program of mass meetings, lectures and forums. It will publish a monthly magazine called The South Today and will organize a defense committee for labor prisoners. Persons interested in aiding this work are invited to communicate with the League for Southern Labor, 304 West Fifty-eighth Street, New York City.

David Mills of Brooklyn, New York, takes us to task for our recent editorial comment [The New Republic, November 6] on Jasper McLevy, Socialist mayor of Bridgeport, Connecticut, in which we complimented McLevy for his honest and liberal administration but pointed out that his reforms have nothing to do with socialism. Mr. Mills thinks that an honest and liberal administration is a major achievement in itself, and asks how could a mere mayor abolish private capitalism and set up a Socialistic order in the municipality of Bridgeport.

William Jay Schieffelin announces the formation of a national committee bearing the title, American Aid for Ethiopia, with headquarters at 2 West Forty-sixth Street in New York City. The Committee is raising funds for medical and other humanitarian services needed in Ethiopia and its board of directors includes Major General John F. O'Ryan and other nationally known persons. . . . E. Irvine Haines protests plagiarism of a series of articles about Peggy Shippen, Major André, Aaron Burr and others written by him and published in The New York Times Sunday Magazine. Mr. Haines says that the material in these articles represents years of research and constitutes his private property and cites instances in which authors of books and articles have appropriated his material in violation of copyright laws.

Three sets of authors this week are seeking material for forthcoming books. Milton L. Rein, whose offices are at 70 West Fortieth Street, New York City, and Leonard Boudin are preparing a book on martial law and would like to hear from anyone who can contribute personal experiences before military courts, actual documents proclaiming martial law and any general information relevant to the subject. . . . Newman White, professor of English in Duke University, is now at 6 Story Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, gathering material for a biography of Percy Bysshe Shelley. He would be glad to hear of unpublished letters, documents, diaries, memoirs or any unusual published material and will carefully return all matter sent to him. . . . Minna F. Kassner, whose offices are at 1359 Broadway, New York City, is working with Lucien Zacharoff on a survey of radio censorship soon to be published by the American Civil Liberties Union. Miss Kassner would especially appreciate immediate notification of any recent instances of censorship known to our readers.

B. Seaver of Philadelphia tells of the formation of a study group in that city by persons interested in preparing the ground for the coming of an American coöperative commonwealth. The group is known as the New Economic Order Seminar and maintains headquarters at 312 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. . . . The Independent Consumers' Coöperative Society, Inc., of 966 Rutland Road, Brooklyn, New York, is working on plans which it hopes will result in the establishment of a coöperative college in New York to train leaders in the coöperative movement. . . . From Santa Barbara, California, comes news of the formation of the Coöperative College of Social Leadership to train leaders in economic and social problems through actual experience in the Santa Barbara County Coöperative Industries.

On the anti-war front, Ammon A. Hennacy, national committeeman of the War Resisters' League, criticizes the military alliance between France and Russia as indicating militarist leanings among the Communists. . . . Violent denunciation of war both in word and picture is contained in a pamphlet just issued by Kerr Eby, American etcher and former private in the camouflage service during the World War. The pamphlet is published by Frederick Keppel and Company, Inc., of New York City, which has placed on view

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dead End

II

I HAVE already written of Mr. Norman Bel Geddes' setting for "Dead End," what an event in the theater it is. The program lists Mr. Kingsley as the director of his play, but adds that it was produced under the personal direction of Mr. Geddes. To those who know his stage work it will be apparent that Mr. Geddes has, at many points, taken a hand. It would, in fact, be interesting to see "Dead End" totally without his participation. We might more easily estimate the quality of the play itself.

A number of motives combine to make the whole story of "Dead End." We have the slum boys with their gangs, one of them, Tommy, an orphan in his sister's charge. We have the gangster returning for a sight of his mother, and her contempt for him—she slaps his face and curses him. We have the architect, born in the neighborhood and a boyhood companion of the gangster. The architect is in love with a young lady who lives with a man in this fashionable apartment house that encroaches on the slums. The architect betrays the gangster to the police for the reward that may enable him to marry her, but in the end she cannot see her way to do it. The little rich boy from the same apartment house has been tormented by the street boys. His father comes to defend him and gets a cut on the wrist. One of the boys tells on Tommy, who did the stabbing. The idea of the stabbing has been given him by the gangster, who, after his mother and the girl he has so long remembered fail him, takes pleasure in adding what he can to the boys' corruption. Tommy is to be sent to the reform school and we are led to think that his course will some day follow the gangster's. At the very last of the play, however, the architect assures Tommy's sister that the reward money will hire a lawyer to clear her brother.

So brief a recounting does not improve the story, of course, nor can it indicate the emphases that the visual stage moments give to it. Nevertheless, the play all through needs sharper accentuation and scored patterns.

There is, for instance, the fine motif of the returning killer and the neighborhood gang of boys headed in the same direction he has taken. As I recall the play at that point, the first definite indication of the gangster's pleasure in this evil instruction comes after he has been scorned by his mother. The whole pattern here is good and could be very fine—this returning killer, hungry for the sight of his mother, reviled by her, turning to teach the boys his tricks, meeting the girl he has never forgotten, finding her a prostitute and diseased, the romance left between them, the reviving passion suddenly putrid with physical revulsion, the killer finally betrayed and shot, for the sake of money by which another slum boy—the architect—grown up decent, may marry the society lady, and at last the money being used to keep the boy from the reformatory and a future parallel to the killer's. The line throughout the course of this motif could be clearer and sharper and thus more dramatic—in fact, from certain reviews I have read and comments I have heard, it would seem that to many Tommy does go to the reformatory and will follow the gangster's footsteps. I took it that his course was to be [illegible] money gained at the gangster's cost. This could be a good keen irony, plus a touch of the mystery of human nature and human destiny. Either way we have a good ending for the play; all that is needed is sharper pointing up.

The architect and the society girl's theme wabbles somewhat. The point that she may really love him, but cannot find it in herself to break past the barriers of her world, would go deeper for being more distinctly given.

As in many of our plays, almost all of them in fact, the speeches in "Dead End" that are most serious in sentiment go badly. The architect drawing improved slums may do, if said with tact and taste—it would be better, perhaps, to have everybody or anybody but the architect himself talk about it (this is a good hint). But the speeches about seeing stars in the water and sailing the boats in the gutters, sewers and so on, are appalling, completely banal, pseudo-poetic, harmful to the whole cause of serious theatre.

The playing of the youngsters who make up the street gang is astonishing beyond words. The sounds and movements identical with the real thing, the varieties exhibited, and the projection, are all beyond praise. It could be added, nevertheless, that there is a little too much of these boy scenes for the play's good. They contrive now and again to wander from the play's main line, though, of course, a certain wandering is advisable in order to avoid an obviously thematic effect. This objection is for the play's sake. The moments in themselves where the boys take the scene are always engaging. Miss Marjorie Main, as the gangster's mother, gave one of those brief electrifying performances that are exactly right and that bring down the house. For people interested in acting I may say that this proves nothing beyond the moment. The player in such cases might or might not be remarkable for a more prolonged scene or role. As it stands that meeting between son and mother is thrilling. Meantime, it is to be said that Mr. Joseph Downing in this scene was quite as good, in a different way, as Miss Main. His entire portrayal is admirable; and, taking it as a gangster problem, we can study his performance for its really profound differences from gangster playing in general, even when highly proficient and applauded. Miss Sheila Trent, as the girl the killer wanted to see again and found but the dregs of, was excellent.

I have said already that Mr. Geddes' setting for "Dead End" was not only a great translation; it was organically different from most of our stage realism. But there is one place where the effect, it seems to me, could be carried further. On the left of the audience the scene shows the gate of the fashionable apartment house and its wall, with the terrace above. On this side of the stage a good deal dramatically could be done by light. There could be at times more of a certain finality or variation of the light in the entrance passage. The terrace, as we have it now, is much neglected. We could, for example, have it soft at times, when the street below is hard, we could have it a delicious festivity when the last act party is in progress, and partially darkened for the spying of the police on the gangster. And the lighting of the terrace wall with its trellis is one of the few tame things in the whole décor. Mr. Geddes will know that I do not mean anything banal here, violent contrasts, obvious shadows and the like. I mean that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Mark Twain the American

THESE three books[1] celebrating the centenary of Mark Twain's birth bear an obvious relation to each other. Mr. Paine, the official biographer and literary executor, perhaps stung by Mr. DeVoto's challenge to publish all the remaining manuscripts, presents the series of diaries and notebooks that Mark Twain kept for many years. The claim that they "are now offered in full" may be accepted as substantially correct, although excisions are indicated in the explanatory comments of the editor. Mr. Wagenknecht supplies a lucid account of Mark Twain's experience and character in the three epochs of his life. Finally, Mr. Cyril Clemens has collected some scores of the familiar anecdotes of Mark Twain's humor, varying from the pungency of his remark when charged four dollars for crossing Lake Galilee: "No wonder Our Lord walked," to the extreme limit of fatuous dullness.

Mr. Wagenknecht's essay is industriously based upon all of Mark Twain's writings available, and takes account of pretty much everything written about him. The two most important interpretations of his character are Van Wyck Brooks's "The Ordeal of Mark Twain" and Bernard DeVoto's "Mark Twain's America." According to the former, Mark Twain was an introvert suffering from the suppression of the great gift which it is death to hide, and ending in conscious frustration and black pessimism. In the latter Mr. DeVoto presents an extrovert, intensely alive to the experiences offered by varying environments. Mr. Wagenknecht finds both theories useful, but he inclines to the second.

Undeniably Mark Twain's genius lay in absorbing life and relating it. It was his happy fortune to grow up in contact with a unique and most typical aspect of American experience—that furnished by the frontier; and in his boyhood at Hannibal, his travels as journeyman printer, his life of adventure on the Mississippi and in the mining camps of Nevada, his reporting in San Francisco, he laid up material for the nourishment of his original genius as a writer of American picaresque. He inherited the great folk tradition of American humor. Later he came into contact with official American literature in New England, and what was distinctively American business. He saw Europe through the eyes of an American. His humor turned to satire. Finally, in his old age, he became the complete American pessimist. Those who would see in his later prophecies a special case of frustration can doubtless call up a dozen old men who were similarly embittered but, with an equal command of profanity, lacked the trenchancy of Mark Twain's comment. It is possible to blame Mark Twain for surrender to the conventional, for inconsistencies and suppressions, but in these he was at one with his countrymen. Mr. Van Wyck Brooks in "The Ordeal of Mark Twain" has written a morality that might be called "Every American."

How completely American was Mark Twain's attitude appears more clearly the more his private thought is laid bare. Mr. Wagenknecht notes "two elements in his temperament—the tendency to bow down and worship, the tendency to tear the idol from its throne and grind it to powder." He was the complacent admirer of Carnegie, H. H. Rogers and Grover Cleveland, and also "the first of the debunkers"—both American traits. He showed American individualism in his declaration: "There are no standards—of taste in wine, cigars, poetry, prose, etc. Each man's own taste is the standard." It is noticeable that in what Mr. Brooks marks as his failures and weaknesses, he associated himself with his countrymen. There is the famous epigram: "In our country we have those three unspeakably precious things: freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, and the prudence never to exercise either of them." He is surprised "that the world is not full of books that scoff at the pitiable world, and the useless universe, and the violent, contemptible human race—curious, for millions of men die every year with these feelings in their hearts. Why don't *I* write such a book? Because I have a family. There is no other reason. Was this those other people's reason?" And finally there is the evidence that he thought of himself as a type of the universal in his remark: "I have found there is no ingredient of the race which I do not possess in either a small or a large way."

Mr. Wagenknecht remarks that Mark Twain, like Doctor Johnson, seems to loom more impressively in literature as a personality than as a writer. To this judgment the anecdotes of his sayings and doings collected by Mr. Cyril Clemens bear witness. Especially is this true of the last period of his life. Here his writing becomes more personal; the entries in the notebooks become more copious. Two sacred subjects, Christianity and patriotism, occupied the thoughts of the Sage of Redding and drew forth such violent expressions of his feeling that his literary executors have delayed long to give his utterances to the world. Mark Twain could see no sense in the Christian belief in the fatherhood of God and the consequent dignity of the human race. His reading of science and history denied both. He set forth his argument in "The Mysterious Stranger," an apologue which does not greatly support Mr. Brooks's contention that Mark Twain might have been the Swift of his age. The entries in the notebooks, recalling as they do his conversational violence, are much more forthright. A certain metaphor haunted him as early as 1887: "Special providence! That phrase nauseates me—with its implied importance of mankind and triviality of God. In my opinion these myriads of globes are merely the blood corpuscles ebbing and flowing through the arteries of God and we but animalculae that infest them, disease them, pollute them; and God does not know we are there and would not care if He did."

In regard to nationalism, war and revolution, Mark Twain's views were inconsistent. He was taken in by the Spanish War, though he attacked the subjugation of the Philippines; he withdrew an article written on the Boer War; he withheld from publication his "War Prayer" quoted in The New Republic of October 16; he abandoned Gorky and the Russian Revolution of 1906 because of a silly moral prejudice. All this Mr. Wagenknecht candidly admits, and explains by Mark Twain's belief in the omni-

[1] Mark Twain's Notebook, prepared for publication by Albert Bigelow Paine. New York: Harper and Brothers. 413 pages. $4.
Mark Twain: The Man and His Work, by Edward Wagen-

LICENSED BY LINZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ship to see what popular opinion thought of the murder of Abel before I openly condemned Cain. I should have had my private opinion, of course, but I shouldn't have expressed it until I had felt the way." These private opinions are now available in their devastating subversiveness. "We have thrown away the most valuable asset we have—the individual's right to oppose both flag and country when he (just he by himself) believes them to be in the wrong. We have thrown it away; and with it all that was really respectable about the grotesque and laughable word, Patriotism." And again, "I would not voluntarily march under this country's flag, or any other, when it was my private judgment that the country was in the wrong."

As for revolution, Mark Twain wrote to Howells that reading Carlyle's "French Revolution" in 1871 he was a Girondin; in 1887, a Sans-Culotte. "Carlyle teaches no such doctrine, so the change is in me—in my vision of the evidences." And he asks further: "Do these liberation parties think they can succeed in a project which has been attempted a million times in the history of the world and has never in one single instance been successful—the 'modification' of a despotism by other means than bloodshed?"

Mr. Wagenknecht presents these opinions with a definite sense of their bearing on the questions of the present day. If Mark Twain concealed them out of regard to his family, he did so with no conviction of sin or cowardice, but rather of ordinary American prudence. It may be argued that published in his lifetime they would have condemned him to an ignominious martyrdom, while now they come with all the authority of his greatness to a world that sorely needs them.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

The Newest History

The History of Western Civilization, by Harry Elmer Barnes, with the Collaboration of Henry David. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company. 2 vols., 2,030 pages. $10.

THESE volumes appear as examples of the New History. The author proclaims his affiliation with this in the preface, and adds an impressive list of his qualifications for writing it. The task of composing a History of Western Civilization should be eminently suited to his type of mind, and he honestly acknowledges that it is. Synthesis, not research, he says, has been his chief concern.

In preparing these two volumes Mr. Barnes has read an astounding amount of scholarly literature and has incorporated the results of the ablest and most recent research (or, more completely, surveys of research) in many phases of history. Books direct from the press, even publications of 1935, have been used. The pages strut with the names of authorities. One of Mr. Barnes's favorite approaches to the problems of each chapter is that of a historical analysis of the bibliography, and by the time the reader has followed through these analyses he should, as Mr. Barnes expressly desires, have a satisfactory introduction into the social sciences. There is also the tendency to clinch a point by quoting repeatedly or by referring to the testimony of contemporary scholars. The personnel of the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association has a more prominent place in this work than that of the ruling dynasties of any historical epoch. Professors Shotwell, James Harvey Robinson and Westermann are given as much attention as

point. Mr. Barnes's work was checked and double-checked by a list of scholars running to one and one-half pages. Each chapter was approved by at least two specialists, and many of them by even more. "The History of Western Civilization" emerges from the press under the most dignified and reliable of auspices, as free from blemishes of fact as a work of its size and character can well be. It may almost be described as an epitome of present-day historical knowledge, and in some respects it offers a test of the quality of historical research.

The first volume, covering the ancient oriental, classical and medieval civilizations, and the transition to modern times, reveals the New History at its best. The social, economic and institutional bases of each civilization are portrayed with a compactness and precision of analysis that one has expected of work in those epochs since the days of Gibbon, Grote and Mommsen. "The philosophy of pedantic futility"—Mr. Barnes's expression for those unable to effect large historical syntheses—has never been held by the greatest scholars of these early ages. In fact, they have been more convincing practitioners of the New History than Mr. Barnes; for, competent as he shows himself in the social-scientific analysis of these civilizations, in the fields of literature and the fine arts, Mr. Barnes has failed to emulate these classical historians or to use the works of their "pedantic" specializing successors. If ever a body of literature and art has been written about from all angles in all ways, it is that of Greece and Rome. Surely, Mr. Barnes could have offered the reader something better than a catalogue of names with a few descriptive phrases.

In the second volume, covering the modern era, Mr. Barnes becomes the unfortunate victim of the analytic indecision or confusion that characterizes the attempts of scholars to describe these centuries as civilizations. While he uses the accepted skeleton—absolutism, liberalism, democracy, nationalism, imperialism—he fails to articulate the pieces to it; even in the parts where a New Historian trained in sociology and anthropology should be most skilled, he leaves the reader with the feeling of precarious uncertainty. The New History becomes a battle between mass and space; Mr. Barnes seems determined to test how much information can be crammed into one chapter and he is often content to work by inorganic layers rather than to mold an organic whole. The old chronological political history, which Mr. Barnes promised (see his preface) to exclude for us, creeps back into place; the history of ideas is reduced to dry and disconnected summaries running parallel with a kind of economic history that does not omit a name, a date or an invention. On one page Mr. Barnes has mentioned some thirty-five names of persons; on another, twenty-four; the reader must halt on page after page before an array of persons or events or ideas or institutions that are identified either partially and incompletely or not at all. If he knows enough already to distinguish these names, he can dispense with Mr. Barnes's pages; if he doesn't, he will be aided infrequently by them.

In the preface Mr. Barnes assures the reader that he has "conceived and executed" this work "without any moralistic preconceptions or any idea of a 'mission' to humanity." None the less, he remains the rationalist, the critic of modern law, the antagonist of supernatural, dogmatic religion; he dislikes as intensely as ever the control of sex by puritanism, the Schmitt thesis on the causes of the World War, the Peace of Versailles. His denunciations of finance capital would delight any Western baiter of Wall Street, and his political and economic views are those of the liberal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interpretations cannot be doubted. True to his social, secular interpretation of religion, he almost completely ignores the person of Christ; and while admitting the enormous historical significance of the development of the Hebrew God, he does nothing by way of explaining this development. His affection for the uninhibited Greeks, free from doubts of sin and sex, and for the eighteenth-century rationalists, is as clearly evident as his dislike of Romanticism and Conservatism. Other instances could easily be given.

The deficiencies in this work must not be blamed altogether on the author. The strong points and the weak points of it disclose fairly well those of the historical work of the past few decades. These weaknesses stand out clearly: first, that comparative history is still in its infancy; second, that far too little has been done in the way of integrating cultural history with social, economic and political, especially for modern times; third, that very little has been tried toward applying the results of modern social science to the study of the past, particularly to the study of modern history. The New History as practised by Mr. Barnes offers no exception; in the cultural sections it does not approach the level of the old-style political history. In the portrayal of causality, in the analysis of social, economic and institutional data, Mr. Barnes functions at his best. His description of the transition from the Roman Empire to the Middle Ages, for example, gives the causal sequences in fine fashion; the detail is rich and the thought fairly clear. Like all Mr. Barnes's books this one is interesting and, for a novice in the history of civilization, should be stimulating. Pioneers are needed in the writing of histories of civilization and should not be discouraged. But our present knowledge seems scarcely sufficient to produce a Thucydides of "the complete record of man's development on our planet." EUGENE NEWTON ANDERSON.

African Travelogue

Africa Dances, by Geoffrey Gorer. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 360 pages. $3.50.

WHAT AT the present time is the value of books about voyages to supposedly little known countries? To what degree is it possible for untrained observers to describe primitive civilizations entirely foreign to them? What kind of analysis of colonial policy can be given by those who feel and experience the problems involved, rather than study them? These are some of the questions that arise as one regards the steady procession of travelers' tales being published, particularly in the case of this book, which clearly points the issues. For here we are confronted with the task of evaluating an honest book that discusses native life and colonial policy in West Africa as seen by a man who, though widely traveled, has as his chief interests (according to a biographical notice on the dust cover) politics, painting and gardening.

That such works can have considerable literary value is not to be denied and since Mr. Gorer's book is interesting and well written, it should have no difficulty in holding the attention of its readers. Not so much, however, can be said for the material in it. As is usually the case with untrained observers, the author is overwhelmed by the complexity of life in West Africa and, as a result, either attributes to the Negroes an all-embracing mysticism that is belied by their hard-headed approach to everyday life, or [illegible] above all being doctrinaire. His interpretation veers be-

The title of the book expresses intent rather than content, for there is relatively little space given to discussion of African dances, and what discussion there is, falls into the inevitable terms of general description. I find that when the book deals with Dahomeans, concerning whom I am competent to speak, there are so many errors of fact and interpretation that it is impossible even to begin to give them in the space at my disposal. The author's speculations concerning African mentality annoy me. The Negro, particularly the Negro chief, is a subtle individual and it takes more than a casual visit to understand him. And as to the observations on French and British colonial administration in this book, though these constitute a severe and not unmerited indictment, if it is information I am after, I can find much more significant data in such a work as Raymond Leslie Buell's "The Native Problem in Africa." What I do like in Mr. Gorer's presentation is the fact that it is not oversensationalized, and that the descriptions, if not the interpretations, of ceremonies, and above all, the photographs, are perfectly valid.

This book, then, is worth reading if one is interested in lively accounts of ventures and misadventures. But I would not recommend it to those in search of definite information concerning the parts of West Africa with which I am familiar. MELVILLE J. HERSKOVITS.

Spain and the Jews

The Expulsion of the Jews from Spain, by Valeriu Marcu. Translated by Moray Firth. New York: The Viking Press. 181 pages. $2.25.

FROM 1413, when in the papal palace of Tortosa a disputation was held between Jewish rabbis and Catholic scholars until 1492, when they were finally expelled, the Jews in Spain had the torturing distinction of being a public problem. The attention fixed upon the Jewish race in the disputation of Tortosa was rapidly given practical application in a fury of conversion. A Christian family that could count a stubborn Jewish soul among its spiritual gains felt itself certain of heaven. With much apparent good to gain and only burdens to lose, great numbers of Jews allowed themselves to be converted.

It was not long before these numerous converts had become bishops, lords, royal counsellors and other sorts of notables. The appearance of the Jewish converts in a new role, no longer as saved souls but as more dangerous competitors in the struggle for position and power, brought on a reaction. The Inquisition, pretending to rediscover the old Jew in the new Christian, was its malignant expression. Soon purity of blood succeeded upon purity of faith as the motive of persecution, and the problem was solved by the dissolution of the Jewish community in Spain, through the simple means of expulsion.

The closeness of the parallel with the Jews in modern Germany is striking. Since their admission to civil rights in Germany, the Jews have taken a foremost place in the country's intellectual life. German Jews listened as eagerly to the assimilationists as the Spanish Jews listened to the converters. Having become good Germans, today they find themselves rediscovered as Jews, and what was pressed on them becomes their sin. They are harried again by the purity-of-blood doctrine.

Obviously, in the calm and graceful writing of this book, the author has attempted to be cool and objective, to avoid

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interest; but he is unsure of the first and he avoids the second for fear of being thought a Marxian materialist. Fear of the obvious, however, leads him to the grotesque. His conclusion is the absurdity that for all their talents, their ardor, their persistence, their sensitiveness and so forth, the Jews had failed to make themselves beloved in Spain or anywhere else. For a historian, with the sad example before him of universal interracial hatred, wherever and as soon as economic interests clash, such a conclusion is unforgivable. ISIDOR SCHNEIDER.

Munsey to the Life

Forty Years—Forty Millions: The Career of Frank A. Munsey, by George Britt. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 317 pages. $3.

JUST NOW when liberalism is on a slab at the morgue and about ready for burial, comes George Britt, a reporter—a good reporter—and produces a masterpiece of impartial objectivity. And he takes a one-sided subject, too: Frank A. Munsey. All his life, Mr. Britt must have been hearing—even as you and I—the impossible legends about this impossible man from Maine who, without a cent, with nothing but the ideals of Augusta, Maine, and the example of our great American successes, came down to the marketplace in New York to make money; and who made money. Forty millions in forty years. A success story, if there ever was one. And he made his killing in an art—in journalism—that is a form of literature; he wrote, edited and published success stories in magazines for youth; his propaganda was a faithful, factual application of the ideals and methods of business, particularly the grocery business (in which he also made millions).

Britt, the reporter-biographer, swept up all the incredible stories, facts, sayings; consulted the dead and wounded; and he pictured a list of the wrecks left by this businesslike editor-publisher on his industrial and speculative career. All without getting down on either side of the liberal fence. Without a weak smile. He collected over years, from Munsey's friends, partners, fellow journalists, bankers, brokers and victims, their experiences, judgments, anecdotes, etc.—a rich harvest of wit, humor and romance. All about a horse-faced bachelor who had no sense of humor.

The collection is unusual stuff for realism, but Britt creates with the data a life, a biography, which in any other land would prove to be the death of an ideal: the rugged individual. After this sad tragedy no one would want to be a triumphant captain of the magazine industry, using his brains and his money to acquire strings of newspapers, famous old newspapers, in Washington, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, New London, etc.—to merge or kill them with the aid of some of the greatest professional newspapermen of his day. "Poor, dear Frank," as President Roosevelt called him, taking his money for the Bull Moose campaign and avoiding the rich sucker. Munsey had the quality, among other qualities he shared with his kind, of being a bore. The life story of Britt's chosen hero is one of the rugged individual's triumph reduced to the merest terms, to properties, powers and millions. And the moral of it all, as Munsey said, was what no poor dear Frank will ever believe: "Money isn't the only thing." Britt doesn't say that: he only quotes it from his lonely, sad millionaire publisher, who finally leaves his enormous fortune to the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

"Frank Munsey personified a great American ideal to the very death. No one but the author of Don Quixote could have done it so well, so definitively, so finally, unless it would be Frank Munsey himself. LINCOLN STEFFENS.

After Strange Gods

Law and the Social Sciences, by Huntington Cairns. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 291 pages. $4.

THIS IS the sort of book that is generally a symposium. But Mr. Cairns has been courageous enough to explore all alone the relations of law to five other social sciences—anthropology, economics, sociology, psychology and political theory. He is most successful in the first and fourth of these, and falls considerably short of an adequate treatment in the others. His approach is one-way and "problematic"—that is, he starts with the assumption that legal study has certain "problems" to solve, and he investigates the ways in which the other studies aid the lawyer in solving these problems. Most of the extensive information and reading he has brought together will be new to the general reader and the practising lawyer, and some of it will have escaped the attention even of the assiduous legal scholar; all of it is arranged in convenient (if somewhat overformal) fashion. The book should help break down whatever parochialism still persists among students of law.

I doubt whether its importance goes beyond that. That the book fails to come alive is not so much a criticism of its manner as of its whole conception. It fails to convey a real sense of the movement and stir that have characterized English and especially American legal thought in the last two decades. Mr. Cairns does not aim at this, but is more concerned with giving a sober, precise and cautious inventory of the findings of various scholars. Yet without an understanding of what impelled them, these findings remain as dead as a card catalogue. And Mr. Cairns offers no unified conception, either of law, social science or the history of social thought, that will relate these various strivings and findings to each other.

The quest of the lawyers after strange gods has had, I think, three stages—or perhaps they are only phases, since they overlap or are found concurrently. One was a sheer desire to break up the old and encrusted legal formulations, the narrowness of Austinianism, the tenacity with which legal theory has held to its primary function of rationalizing the distribution of power in a society. And there was in this phase a somewhat naïve belief that in breaking down the barriers between law and the other social sciences there was an inherent efficacy—that the juxtaposition of the points of view of law and economics, or of law and psychology, would lead inevitably to cross-fertilization. More often, as Alvin Johnson remarked, it led to cross-sterilization.

The second phase was the "needs of life" point of view which underlay a good part of the American sociological approach to law, a sort of ethical functionalism which has left a deep imprint on our legal thought but which has also often led to wishful thinking. There are evidences that legal thought is passing into a third phase, in which it is no longer content to make forays of self-liberation into surrounding fields, and has also passed beyond the vagueness of the "needs of life" view. It sees that legal theory must confront the basic problems that all thinking must confront when it deals with man's behavior and its regulation; but that it must work them [illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law. This is history, psychology, sociology, what you will, rolled into one. To count on specific illuminations from other social sciences, which may themselves be only jack-in-the-pulpits bouncing out after every ray of light and no closer to social understanding than law is, may in the end prove but a borrowing of weaknesses. And law must knit together in its own terms whatever it derives from its borrowings: in the end a sociological theory of law (and the same is true of literature or any other phase of life) must be not sociology but law, and have the fiber of law.

I cannot help feeling the book would have been more valuable if it had boldly attempted an independent analysis—started with the vital trends today in legal thinking and traced them wherever they led. I fear that Mr. Cairns's method has allowed some of the most important thinkers to fall through the crevices. Thus there is no consideration (except in asides) of Max Weber or Pareto, of Veblen, of John R. Commons. The Freudian approach to law is not mentioned. The references to the Marxian schools are not only casual but reveal no knowledge of the subject; and yet there is an important Continental literature to be assimilated. My guess is that the discussion of Laski's pluralism might have been less conventional if the author had recognized that it has developed into a Marxian theory of the state and of law, and traced the logic by which this has been brought about. And finally, there is no consideration of the most important of the newer American sociological schools of law—that of the realists, into whose thinking flow many important streams from the social sciences. To have considered such figures and approaches adequately might have given the book greater richness and unity.

MAX LERNER.

Books in Brief

A Modern History of Europe: 1046-1918, edited by J. Hampden Jackson. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1,236 pages. $3.75.

THIS IS a model outline of history for the army of harassed men and women who are in need of a background. Without any depressing warnings about the choice before us, civilization versus chaos, and happily without any fanfare of pseudo-philosophical laws of causation, growth and decay, the four historians (Oliver J. G. Welch, P. C. Gordon Walker, H. E. Howard and C. J. Pennethorne Hughes) who coöperated in its writing have produced a readable, trustworthy and, at times, brilliant synthesis of the best and most recent scholarly research. Many aspects of Europe's history had to be omitted for lack of space, but nothing essential to an understanding of the cross currents of European existence has been sacrificed. The scholarship is completely unobtrusive, but it is implicit throughout in the compact chapter organization, in the skillful selection of basic bits of evidence, in the unerring emphasis upon the significant acts and trends, and above all, in the intelligent commentaries and conclusions.

L. G.

Secrets of the White Lady, by Captain Henry Landau. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 314 pages. $3.

It must be the immediate physical danger always associated with spying that makes Captain Landau's pages such fascinating reading. The secret-service organization that he ran during the War behind the German lines used no secret panels or marvelous disguises, and had not a single

Books for Readers and Writers

READING AND WRITING

THE CRAFT OF FICTION, by Percy Lubbock, $2. Peter Smith, 847 Fifth Ave., New York.

THE WRITER'S ART, edited by Rollo Walter Brown, $2.50. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

DICTIONARIES

STANDARD DICTIONARY SERIES; NEW STANDARD DICTIONARY (Unabridged). The one great authority on words. Buckram, indexed, $18; sheep, indexed, $22. **PRACTICAL STANDARD DICTIONARY**, cloth, $5; Fabrikoid, $6; Full Leather, $7.50. Funk & Wagnalls Company, 354 Fourth Ave., New York.

DICTIONARY OF PHRASE AND FABLE, by E. C. Brewer. New edition, popular price, $3.50. J. B. Lippincott Co., Washington Sq., Phila.

CROWELL'S DICTIONARY OF BUSINESS AND FINANCE. A valuable reference book. $3.50. Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 393 Fourth Ave., New York.

LITERARY HISTORY

THE FOREGROUND OF AMERICAN FICTION, by Harry Hartwick, $2.50. American Book Co., 88 Lexington Ave., New York.

QUOTATIONS

THE HOME BOOK OF QUOTATIONS, classic and modern, including recent American; 72,000 quotations. Indexed by author and key words, arranged by subject. 2,600 p., best in field. $10. Dodd, Mead, 449 4th Ave., N. Y.

HOYT'S NEW CYCLOPEDIA OF PRACTICAL QUOTATIONS, revised by Kate Louise Roberts. $7.50. Funk & Wagnalls Company, 354 Fourth Ave., New

Note

This directory, published in the third issue of every month, is designed to advertise those Standard Works of Reference, Handbooks, Dictionaries, and Anthologies and such helps for readers and writers as will be of particular interest to the audience that The New Republic reaches. The books here presented have been carefully selected by the various publishers with the needs of the intelligent reader and practicing or developing writer especially in mind. The New Republic feels that in the monthly publication of this directory a real service will be performed for both its readers and the publishers. Because its content will vary from month to month, we suggest that you regularly check the listings for your immediate needs.

GENERAL

LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY: cloth $2.50, leather $3.50. Descriptive list of the series on application to *Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.*

POETRY AND PROSE

ENGLISH POETS: ROMANTIC, VICTORIAN AND LATER, by James Stephens, E. L. Beck and R. H. Snow, with Introduction by Stephens. $6. **ENGLISH ROMANTIC POETS**, $8. **VICTORIAN AND LATER**, $4. American Book Co., 88 Lexington Ave., New York.

THE USE OF POETRY AND THE USE OF CRITICISM, by T. S. Eliot, $2.00. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

ENCYCLOPEDIA

NEW INTERNATIONAL ENCYCLOPEDIA. Popular-priced edition. Write for full particulars. Funk & Wagnalls Company, 354 Fourth Ave., New York.

ANTHOLOGIES

AN ANTHOLOGY OF LIGHT VERSE. *Edited by Louis* Kronenberger. No. 48 in the MODERN LIBRARY. 95c. Send for list of 236 titles, to: 20 E. 57 St., N. Y. City.

GREAT AMERICANS AS SEEN BY THE POETS, an anthology by Burton Stevenson, $3.50. J. P. Lippincott Co., Washington Sq., Phila.

HANDBOOKS

DESK BOOK OF ERRORS IN ENGLISH, $1.50; **DESK BOOK OF 25,000 WORDS FREQUENTLY MISPRONOUNCED**, $2.50; **HOW TO USE ENGLISH**, $2.50. **HOW TO SPEAK ENGLISH EFFECTIVELY**, $1.75; and **WORDS WE MISSPELL**, $1.50, by Frank H. Vizetelly. Funk & Wagnalls Company, 354 Fourth Ave., New York.

THE SECRETARY'S GUIDE TO CORRECT MODERN USAGE, by C. O. Sylvester Mawson. Ambitious secretaries find it indispensable. $2.00. Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 393 Fourth Ave., New York.

ROGET'S INTERNATIONAL THESAURUS, edited by C. O. S. Mawson, 837 pages, 8vo, $3.00, thumb indexed, $3.50. Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 393 Fourth Ave., New York.

LICENSED TO UCR
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beautiful woman employed to seduce young officers of the General Staff. It ran like any other factory and depended not on brilliant individuals but on mass production; two hundred spies were twice as valuable as one hundred spies. The most valuable ones had large families and lived along the railroad tracks; behind curtains the children counted passing troop-trains in the daytime; the parents counted them at night. Aside from the constant, the awful danger, it was like any other sweatshop work, dull and dreary and very badly paid. N. A.

Fire Testament, by Willard Maas. New York: The Alcestis Press. 68 pages. $7.50.

Those who meet Willard Maas's published work will admire its inventiveness and exhilaration. It is too closely textured to allow much dissection by the epigram-hunters; its repetition of symbols, significant to the poet alone, will cause impatience; and special complaint will arise from Maas's general lack of "things to say." He seldom argues; nor does he describe formally, narrate, glorify, satirize. He merely *feels,* is *aware* of his surroundings, which release his emotion as Tchelitchev settings do for the sensitive ballet artist. Professor S. Foster Damon's introduction speaks of his technique as "derived from the process of dream" and of his rhythm as "intuitive." This does not imply kinship to those deluded poets who constantly make zombies of themselves to produce masterpieces by the "unconscious method." Every poem in "Fire Testament" is alive, healthily created, more color-strewn than any verse since the Imagists, suggestive of Wallace Stevens' serenity (without his wit) and of W. C. Williams' gusto (without his concreteness). K. Q.

They Lived: A Brontë Novel, by E. Thornton Cook. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

This orderly novelized story of the Brontë family almost succeeds, with the pretty illustrations, in giving a Louisa May Alcott cast to the facts. But the facts and the excerpts from diaries restore, page by page, some of the gritty texture of the original lives. The book is doubtless a reaction from that dark psychological tripe written by leading members of the Brontë cult in the years just gone by. Charlotte gets the spotlight once again, just as she used to in Mrs. Gaskell's day, before the moderns discovered a bigger Brontë in dateless Emily. Although this is not a very good book—novelizing these novelists is a dismal failure—it is a better and more human introduction to the Haworth women than most lectures in college class rooms being given this fall. The class is dismissed. G. T.

Mr. Aristotle, by Ignazio Silone. New York: Robert M. McBride and Company. $2.

The present five stories, like the previous novel "Fontamara," are of Italian peasants in a mountain village. Although now exiled in Zurich, Silone moves among his people with the ease of a neighbor, while he speaks of them with the caustic sympathy of a true, objective art. He refuses to invest his stories with any zip, or drum-roll endings, for the life in them must justify itself. You have, for example, the tale of Simplicio, the gentle anarchist. Jailed by the Fascisti on every holiday to "preserve the peace," actually Simplicio is the best behaved peasant in Purgatory. But one day the town hall of adjacent, bourgeois New Town burns and the police come, out of habit, for Simplicio—who takes to the hills. Immediately, thereby, he gains the admiration of the peasantry, who see a sly one

MALCOLM COWLEY
Of the NEW REPUBLIC
Opens The League of American Writers Lecture Series
"MIND OF AMERICA"
Monday—NOVEMBER 18—8:30 P. M.
at the
HOTEL DELANO
108 West 43rd Street, New York
speaking on
"The American Intelligentsia"
Single Admission: Thirty-five Cents
Season ticket (20 lectures) for $4.50. . . . Corliss Lamont, Earl Browder, Peter Blume and many others.
for information call:
League of American Writers, 156 Fifth Avenue, WA 9-7925

THREE LECTURES BY
FRANCIS HACKETT
Author of "HENRY VIII" and "FRANCIS I"
NOV. 21, Problems of the Historical Biographer
DEC. 5, Problems of the Novelist
DEC. 12, Critics and Criticism
THURSDAY EVES., 8:30. Series, $3. Single admission, $1
THE NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEACH
66 West 12th Street, New York. ALgonquin 4-2567

THE THEATRE GUILD *Presents*
(in association with JOHN C. WILSON)
The Taming of the Shrew
with ALFRED LUNT & LYNN FONTANNE
GUILD THEATRE, 52nd Street, West of Broadway
Evgs. 8:40. Matinees Thursday & Saturday, 2:40
THE THEATRE GUILD *Presents*
GEORGE GERSHWIN'S
PORGY and BESS
Book by Du Bose Heyward
Lyrics by Du Bose Heyward and Ira Gershwin
Directed by ROUBEN MAMOULIAN
ALVIN THEATRE, 52nd St., W. of Broadway. Evgs. 8:30
Matinees Thursday and Saturday, 2:30

"A first night audience greeted this turn of events with such cheers and bravos as have resounded through no playhouse since the season began."—*Richard Lockridge, Sun.*
"LET FREEDOM RING"
BROADHURST THEA. 44th St. W. of Broadway | Evenings: 50c to $2.50 Mats.: Wed. & Sat. 50c to $1.50

The New Film Alliance announces A Film Showing and Open Forum
In What Direction is the March of Time Marching?
U. S. Congressman MARCANTONIO will publicly declare "Towards Reaction and Fascism."
Several issues of MARCH OF TIME will be shown and defended by a prominent person
SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 17th, at 6:45 and 9:00 P. M. at
THE NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH, 66 WEST 12TH STREET, N. Y.
TICKETS 50c IN ADVANCE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Simplicio to return and lead a revolt. But Simplicio, the clever one, never comes. He is found dead in the hills. None of the magnificent banditry accredited to him is his. And there the story ends. You know that the peasants take their cut in harvest wages and go home, as before, to beat their wives and eat cornmeal mush. There is not a sentimental word in this book, yet you know that Silone loves and respects these people. His manner of telling their stories is wedded to their own peasant character, pungent and stub-fingered; he sees nothing they do not see, nor says anything they do not say. There they are, his good-natured, nose-picking friends, and you can like them or not. They are nothing if not genuine. R. L.

This Bed Thy Center, by Pamela Hansford Johnson. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.

Miss Johnson tells her publishers that she wrote this first novel "because somebody told me I couldn't write a novel at all." "This Bed Thy Center" seems to have all the required ingredients. It has its full quota of types, among them some whimsical stallkeepers, a "town's best unpaid loose woman," a female evangelist and her unhappy children, a barmaid, a school teacher, and a cockney anarchist who cries "Blow 'em down!" at frequent intervals. Each quaint in his own way, they rollick around a London suburb, acting as comic relief to a dull but ducky story of adolescent love. After wading many a sluggish stream of consciousness, the reader emerges with the story of how Elsie loved Roly, and Roly loved Elsie, and after a few mild misunderstandings they were wed. C. B.

Contributors

DON GORDON lives in Hollywood, California. His verse has been published in Poetry, The Windsor Quarterly, The New York Herald Tribune Books, The Midland, Thomas Moult's anthologies, The Lyric and other magazines.

A. I. BEZZERIDES writes: "I was born in Samsoun, Turkey, in 1908. My father is Greek and my mother is Armenian. I came to this country when I was nine months old, so you can see that I got all my ideas straight from Moscow. Went to the University of California for six years preparing myself for a job which I never got. I am now working very long hours at a very low salary and I believe in the future of this country. Any country that has as many college graduates sweeping streets, collecting garbage, dispensing sodas and attending gas stations as this one, has a beautiful future."

EUGENE NEWTON ANDERSON is a professor in the History department of the University of Chicago.

MELVILLE J. HERSKOVITS is professor of Anthropology at Northwestern University. He has done ethnological field work among the people of West Africa.

ISIDOR SCHNEIDER is a poet, novelist and critic whose published volumes include a book of verse, "Comrade Mister" and his recent novel, "From the Kingdom of Necessity."

LINCOLN STEFFENS is now living quietly at Carmel, California, after a long and adventurous career as an editor, journalist and crusader for liberal causes.

MAX LERNER, author of numerous articles in the fields of economics and political science, recently resigned as lecturer in the department of Government at Harvard University to join the editorial staff of The Nation.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Leo Geshoy, Nathan Asch, Kerker Quinn, Genevieve Taggard, Richard Leekley and Carlton Brown.

The Epic Plan Discussed in an Exciting Debate
Upton SINCLAIR vs. Norman THOMAS
Roger Baldwin, *Chairman*
MECCA TEMPLE, Sunday, Nov. 17th, at 8 P. M.
Tickets: 55c, 83c, $1.10, $1.65. From: Socialist Call, Workers' Bookshop, Rand School, Columbia Univ. Bookstore and New York Forum.
Auspices: New York Forum, 39 East 10th Street, New York City
Subject: Production for Use—Can It Be Established under Capitalism?

INTERNATIONAL WORKERS SCHOOL
Announces Two Lectures On
Marxism and Modern Thought
PROFESSOR SIDNEY HOOK
1. MARXISM AND MODERN SCIENCE
Friday, November 15, at 8 P. M.
2. MARXISM AND MODERN PHILOSOPHY
Friday, November 22, at 8 P. M.
CHURCH OF ALL NATIONS
9 Second Ave. (Near Houston St.) N. Y. C.
Individual Lectures 25 cents
International Workers School, 55 East 11th Street

Coming East to give the speech of the year!
FLOYD B. OLSON Minnesota's Fighting Farmer Labor Governor
"A NEW PARTY—WHEN—AND HOW!"
Also J. S. WOODSWORTH Leader of Canada's Cooperative Commonwealth Movement
Grand Ball Room Hotel Astor (Times Square)
Auspices: Commonwealth Federation of New York.
Tickets—25c—50c—$1.00
Tel.: ALgonquin 4-6195
FRIDAY—NOVEMBER 15th 8:15 P. M.

A DELIGHTFUL HIDE-AWAY
In the mountains inviting people of better taste. Excellent table, solariums, seasonable sports. Library, musicals, open fireplaces.
Chesters' Zunbarg
Woodbourne, N. Y. Tel.: Fallsburg 2F22

VIAJES A MEXICO
For those who want to visit The Mexico Not in Guide Books
Trips the year around
Sponsored and arranged by
THE COMMITTEE ON CULTURAL RELATIONS WITH LATIN AMERICA
289 Fourth Ave. New York

Charming farm, situated on 150 acres of beautiful rolling country. 50 miles from New York. Horses for riding.
HIL-BERT HOUSE
Lake Mahopac, N. Y. Tel: Mahopac 2083

PAUL LUTTINGER, M. D.
and
DANIEL LUTTINGER, M.D.
5 Washington Square North
Office hours: 1—2, 6—8

TSA (Terminable Securities Act). Frederick Soddy, author of Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt, wrote me as follows in 1930: "Dear Sir: I owe you an apology for not acknowledging before your pamphlet 'Ethical Interest.' Your letter of 20 Aug. I have only just received on my return home. The fact is I am deluged with all kinds of economic tracts and pamphlets—and after all I have my own subject which is not economics to think about—most of which to me are exactly as interesting as expositions of the Ptolemaic system of the universe might have been to Copernicus, or as a history of hansom cabs might be to a motor-car maker. I was therefore agreeably surprised to find when I did look into your pamphlet that you are definite and have something businesslike to say. So far as I can see we are in agreement on your main points. Certainly all capital investments should be terminable and automatically wiped out by a sinking fund after a certain sum in excess of the principal is repaid." For the gist of TSA see The New Republic of October 30, page 344, bottom left.

POSITION WANTED

23 LANGUAGES
SPEAK ANY MODERN LANGUAGE IN 3 MONTHS BY LINGUAPHONE
UNIQUE METHOD BRINGS VOICES OF NATIVE MASTERS INTO YOUR OWN HOME..SEND FOR FREE BOOK
LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
41 Rockefeller Center · New York

ORANGES FOR SALE
SWEET, JUICY, sun-ripened on trees. Delivered express prepaid. $3.50 bushel. Grapefruit, $3.50. Tangerines, $3.75. Mixed fruit, $3.50. A. H. Burket, Sebring, Florida.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUB
ESCAPE FROM THE BUGHOUSE of this so-called civilization! CONTACTS, connects

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED